

ノ電信寫機第五十三號ニ添置候得共尙茲ニ小官親シク接手  
セシ寫ノ式ヲ模造シ呈御一閱候右原文中冒頭ニ Your tele-  
gram No. 16 トアルハ彼方發十六號ノ電信ニ對スル回答  
トイフ義ニシテ折目ノ一格ニ「コッビー」云々トアルハ搜  
索ヲ容易ニスル見出ニ有之候或ハ御參考ノ一助トモ可相成  
ト存候ニ付差出候  
右申進候敬具

明治十九年十二月三日

特命全權公使 河 瀬 眞 孝

外務大臣 伯井上馨殿

註 一 二六七附屬書五來電參照

附屬書

十九年十一月十八日英外務卿發在本邦英公使ヘノ訓電

(Copy)

EARL OF IDDESLEIGH TO SIR F. PLUNKETT.

tel. No. 14 (Cypher) F. O.

Nov. 18, 1886.

Your telegram No. 16. You may reassure Japanese Government. We do not desire revival of Consular jurisdiction nor insist on permanence of

foreign judges. But we should like some undertaking that such judges shall be continued for a term, if the native judges should not prove equal to their duties. This could be done by exchange of notes. It should be made clear in Convention, that existing Treaty rights will not revive at expiration of Convention. We are awaiting opinion of German Government on the above points. We think claim of French Minister inadmissible.

### 第三節 對 佛 交 渉

二七〇 明治十九年十二月十六日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
鮫島駐佛公使宛

條約改正交渉方針ニ關スル訓令ノ件

在巴里全權公使鮫島尙信ヘ訓條案

(本文省略)

註 十二年十一月十九日森駐英公使宛訓令同文ナリ

三文書參照

二七一 明治二十年二月三日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
鮫島駐佛公使宛

條約改正交渉ニ關スル件

在佛鮫島公使ヘ内信案

過日森公使ヘ托シ置候一封此書御披見ノ頃ハ最早御落掌且  
同氏トモ御會話我國ノ近況且近來條約改正ニ付テ政府方向  
スル處モ其大略ヲ御承知相成候事ト存候右呈書中申進置候  
通今便貴兄ヘノ内訓狀トタリフノ略目トヲ進呈仕候尤モ  
内訓狀ノ儀ハ外務卿其他ヘ御視示不被成方可然只今後於當

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 二七〇、二七一

地公然談判ヲ開キ候時ハ右ノ大意ト手順ニテ相運ヒ候覺悟  
ニ御座候故其都合ニテ御地政府ヘモ御中立有之度候第一從  
來稅則ノ制限未タ各國政府ヘ判然不申出候故其部類ヲ別チ  
收稅ノ高點ヨリ無稅ノ部迄ノ歩合ヲ相定シモノニ御座候間  
左様御承知有之度候當節ハ實ニ午前九時ヨリ午後五時或ハ  
六時迄諸氏ノ勉勵ニテ多分本月二十日頃迄ニハ精密ナルス  
ベシフキツク、デユチー、トアドバリニムモ充分ニ之ヲ  
分チ或ハ百斤又ハ壹斤ニ付何程ト區別セルタリフヲ差出  
スヘク只當時苦ム所ハ製造所ノ價ト保險料運送賃手數料等  
實ニ從來各國派出領事ヨリ製造價ノ報告モナキ故困難ヲ極  
メ候且運上所ヘ從來外人デクラールドシタル元價ハ市價ニ  
ヨレハ或ハ半價又ハ三分ノ一等ニテ更ニ引當ニ不相成故殊  
ノ外手間取申候右稅目ト航海ト貿易トヲ全結セシ條約草案  
并ニ稅關規則等併セ添差出可申候右稅關規則ハ航海貿易條  
約中附錄ニ致度他ノ港則水先規則等ノ如キハ時日ノ都合ニ  
又ハ場合ノ模様ニヨリテ變換スル事アル故附錄トシテバウ

ンド致度無之附録ニセザル分タリトモ追々御送致及アベシ候又條約體裁ハ先便ニ粗申上置候通りノ次第ニ有之就テハ當方ノ見込又森氏ニモ御會話有之候ハ、同氏ノ意見ヲモ御承知可有之ニ付テハ同氏ノ意見乃チタリ一フヲ條約調印前我政府ヨリ布告シ之ヲ定則トシ其布告ニ因テ十ヶ年或ハ十二ヶ年間變換セサル事ヲ箇條ニ挿入スルトモ又前段ニ條約ト同力ヲ有スル別約ヲナストモ他ノ政府ノ望ニ任セント云一ノ奇ナル體ニ依ルカ只イクヲールヲ含有スル航海貿易條約ニテタリ一フヲ右條約中ニ揭示スルトモ敢テ異存無之候兩條ノ内只森氏ノ說ノ如クニテ佛國政府承諾スレハ好都合ニ御座候自然六ヶ敷キ憾觸ヲ生ズベシト御見込ニ有之候ハ、決シテ御主張無之方ト奉存候間承諾ノ都合ヲ直ニ御電報被下度候就テハ森氏トモ約シ置候様於當地各公使へ咄ス節ハ必兩說ヲ申出シ上ニテ彼等ヨリモ各政府へ報告ヲナサシメ只早ク申サハ彼政府望ム處ニ任スト云位ノ事ニ候間其邊御含ミ被下度候輸入諸品ノ中壹ヶ年輸入ノ價高拾萬圓以上ノ品物ハ僅三拾六品位ナレハ右拾萬圓ノ額以下ニ當ル諸品ハ實ニ雜品ト申モ可ナリ依テ只三割迄ヲマクシユームト相定メ置所謂ゼネラルタリーフ如キ體ニシテ右三割以內ヲ自由ニ高下ス

ルヲ得ルノ目的ヲ以テ於當地公使等へ申出ス積リニ御座候上野ノ說ニ因レハ英政府於テモ格別異論有之間敷哉ノ由ニ御座候則別紙御廻ニ及候間御一覽被下度候尤モ此邊ノ儀ハ今後精密ナルタリーフ差出セシ時佛政府へ御申立ノ方可然候得共先ツ其概略ヲ御申入御試ミ置被下度候只此度ノタリーフハ實ニ粗ナル者故御地外務省へ御持參相成候モ御氣ノ毒ニ候得共只森氏ノ出立ヲ爲急候故不得止次第不惡御諒察被下度候只此制限ノ上ニ出テサル事ヲ其地外務省へ知ラスル迄ニ不過モノニ御座候内訓狀中裁判事件ハ即前便申述候通りノ次第故隨分難題トハ心得居候得共終ニ不被行時ハ行政ニ屬スル地方ノ諸規則等ノ立法丈ハ公使等ヨリ異論ヲ不受シテ彼ノコトニ於テ彼ノ裁判官我設置シタル規則ニ因テ之ヲ裁判シ或ハ罰スト云點ニ歸シ可申候此點タル左迄難題トハ存シ不申候三ヶ月入牢五百圓罰金ノ分八十日ノ入牢貳拾圓ノ罰金ニテモ不承知ハ不申只聊ニテモツバイヤル、アンド、パニシメントヲ掌握スレハ實際彼等ノ自儘ヲ押サユル事又將來裁判權ヲ漸ヲ以テ取歸ヘスノ順序ヲ開ク事故充分相試ミ度覺悟ニ御座候尤先便申上候小刑トハ則地方規則ニ對シヲフエンシープニテ其種類ヲ列スレハ先ボリス、

明治十二年十二月三日

井上 馨

鮫島尙信閣下

追テ（以下省略）

註 「追テ」以下十二年十二月三日附森駐英公使宛内信五文書同文ナリ

二七二 明治十二年二月二十日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
鮫島駐佛公使宛

改正輸入稅率案送付ノ件

鮫島公使別信案 第二十五號

ハーバー、パイロット、ニユウスペーパー、ツレード、又時在テ起ルカランチン其他衛生上或ハ道路修繕又ハレイルウエー、シユーチング等ノ諸規則ニ付キタル事ニテ全體ノクリミナルニ無之又シビルモ當分此儘ニ致シ置可申候又パニシメントノ制限ヲ不好候ハ、則スモールヲフエンシープノ前例シタル如キ規則類ヲ條約中ニ揭示シテ可然事ト存候今兩三日ヲ經候ハ、先ツ粗ナルタリーフハ則此度差出セル通ノモノヲ各公使等へ相渡シ而シテ稅則ノ大略ヲ相示シ條約體裁ノ大意及裁判ノ制限等モ明示シ夫々各本國政府へ掛合吳候様申入候積ニ御座候最早粗ホ見込丈ハ相立居候故漸々調整次第書付テモ可相渡覺悟ニ有之候尤モ右書類各國公使へ可差遣前便前貴方へ御落掌ノ都合ニ相運ヒ候様可致候實ニ此重大ナル事件ヲ取行フニハ通信第一ニ候間御地ヨリ必ス時々御報告是祈候

支那事件モ先日送達致候書類中最後我ヨリ差遣候返簡後ハ未タ何タル通信モ無之尤モ新聞上ニハ種々ノ說モ有之申候同伴ニ付ビットマンヨリ到來候書狀譯文差出候間御一覽被下度候先ハ天津地方氷結中ハ差シタル事件モ有之間敷候佛露獨塊ノ間頻ニ紛紜アルノ風聞多ク露ヨリ佛國へ密使ヲ

本月十五日別紙甲號電信以テ申進候通貿易并ニ航海條約等未タ取調不相濟候間追テ本條約案ト併テ差進候様可致尤精細ノタリフハ當月末迄ニ差出候積ニ候且又先般内達書ニ添差進候輸入稅率謬誤不少候ニ付更ニ改正ヲ加ヘ候分三部不取敢此便ヲ以及遞送候也

十二年十二月

追テ本月十六日別紙乙號貴君ヨリノ電信接手候然ルニ去ル十五日相發候當方ヨリノ電信ニ關シ同十八日別紙丙號ノ通電信差立置候間右ニテ甲號電信ノ大意御了解セララル故乙號ノ貴問ニ對シ答電不差立候間左様御承知可有之候

註 別紙電信甲乙丙號等見當ラズ

二七三 明治十三年一月十七日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
鮫島駐佛公使宛

條約改正交渉ニ關スル件

在佛鮫島公使ヘ内信案

(本文省略)

註 同日附森公使宛内信一七〇文書同文ナリ

我法律ニ服セントスル若干ノ外國人アリ其國政府ニテ公然之ヲ認識スル時ハ其人數ニ限り内地ニ於テ居住商買スル事ヲ許シ候テモ可然却テ治外法權ヲ破ルノ一助共可相成候尤右ハ現存條約ノ最優待國ノ例ニ倣フノ條款ヲ改正シ相當ノ報酬無之テハ此特典ヲ得ル能ハストノ旨更ニ結約致候後ニ非ラテハ元ヨリ實施スヘカラサル事ニ有之候即今我國在留外國公使等ノ如キハ我國ノ情態ヲ熟知致居候故強テ開國ノ議ヲ申出候者モ有之間敷候得共歐洲大陸諸國ニ於テハ開國ヲ以最要ノ件トシ之ヲ望ムノ情アルニ依リ此事ヲ以我請求ヲ承諾スル事ヲ難スルノ辭柄ト致候國モ有之ニ付今後公然談判致候節彼ヨリ發議スルハ顯然ニ有之其際決然返答出來不申テハ自ラ我論鋒ヲ挫キ充分我論旨ヲ主張スル事難相成勢モ有之候間今日直ニ實施スヘカラサルハ勿論ノ義ニ候得共只其決意ヲ要シ候迄ニ有之候右事件實施ノ點ヨリ論スレハ寧ロ諸外國一同我法律ニ服スルヲ待テ開國スルニ如カストノ見込モ可有之候得共其時機到來致候迄此決心ナクテハ談判ノ際開國ノ義ハ彼カ城壘ト爲リ彼ヨリ發論アル毎トニ我之ニ決答スル事能ハス我ヲシテ開國セシメサル所以ノ者ハ曲彼ニ在ルヲ然ルヲ之ヲ轉シテ我ニ歸シ開國セサルハ我

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二七五、二七六

二七四 明治十三年四月一日

鮫島駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

條件附内地開放論ニ付請訓ノ件

別信 第八號

五月十八日到

條約重修一件ニ付外國臣民ノ我國法律ニ服從セン事ヲ欲シ其國政府ニ於テ之ヲ許諾スル時ハ其臣民ニ限り我國ヲ開クヘシトノ義昨年來屢々申進候次第モ有之處何等ノ御答令無之右ハ如何ノ御見込ニ候哉抑右ノ義申出候モ今日外國人ノ我法律ニ服從スル事ヲ望ムヘク且之ヲ實地ニ施行スル事ヲ得ヘキトノ見込ヲ以及建議候譯ニハ無之我國ヲ開カス外人ノ内地ニ住居商買スルヲ許サハ頑固ノ舊慣ニテ拒絶スル者ノ如ク外國ニテハ想像スル者不少ニ付右開國ヲ肯諾セサルハ決テ我政府ノ好ム所ニ無之歐米各國同様外國人我法律ニ服從スル時ハ何時ニテモ國ヲ開クヘシトノ主意辯明決答致候テモ不苦旨兼テ御指令伺置度心得ニテ申出候義ニ御座候若シ又我國内何地タルヲ論セス全ク我法律ニ服從スヘシトノ事ヲ肯諾スル國アラハ其國人ニ限り開國スルモ妨ナカルヘク或ハ某ノ國人不殘我法律ニ從フ事ヲ欲セサルトモ

カ曲ナリトセラルル如キ姿ニ相成一步ヲ譲リ候場合ニ到リ結局全體ノ談判上我ニ不利有之候間前文ノ通我法律ニ服從セント欲シ其國政府ニテ之ヲ許諾スル時ハ其臣民ニ限り我國ヲ開クヘシトノ旨臨機決答致候義兼テ御内許有之度候此段申進候敬具

明治十三年四月一日

特命全權公使 鮫島 尙信

外務卿井上馨殿

二七五 明治十三年五月二日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
鮫島駐佛公使宛

條約改正關係書類取扱方ニ就キ内訓ノ件

内信

(本文省略)

註 同日附森公使宛内信一八一文書殆ント同文ナリ

二七六

明治十三年四月十六日

鮫島駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ト内交渉開始ノ件

八九一

別信 第十號

過日白耳義國へ出張致候節條約重修一件ニ付同國外務卿大輔ト屢々面會シ兼テ御内附相成居候内訓狀ノ主意ニ基キ半公ノ談判ニ涉リ候末終ニ於同政府ハ我政府要求ノ主義異存無之尤諸大國ニ離レ獨立決行ノ處置ハ難致候得共他國政府ニテモ可成同意ノ場合ニ運候様折ヲ以周旋可致積ニ有之トノ旨返答有之且談話ノ際同政府ハ我國ニ對シ充分親切ノ友情ヲ懷キ居候次第吐露致シ候尙委細ハ後便可申進候

一 佛政府ヘノ談判ハ公然タル訓令相達シ候迄差控ヘ可申積ニ候處外務卿ノ多忙モ近日稍落付タル様子ニ有之且訓令ノ到達ヲ待居候テハ追々時日遷延ニ有成候間旁本日午後外務卿ニ面會内訓狀ノ主旨ニ基キ半公ノ談判ヲ始メ候心得ニ有之候何レ其模様ハ追テ詳細御報知可申進候右之件々申進候敬具

明治十三年四月十六日

外務卿井上馨殿

特命全權公使 鮫島 尙 信

一 佛國へ輸入スル日本物品ニ課スヘキ税則ハ同國ニテ實施スル所ノ約定税則或ハ其他ノ税則ニテモ最低額ノ税則ヲ用ユル事

右ノ件々我政府ニテ要求スル理由事情ヲ備ヘ詳細辯明ニ及候處外務卿ニハ差當リ別段一己ノ異存無之候得共即答ニハ難及候間何レ其筋ノ詮議ニ付シタル上回答可致トノ旨口答有之候追テ其模様ハ分リ次第可申進候右口述條件中佛國へ輸入ノ日本物品ニ課スヘキ税則ノ事ハ別ニ御訓令無之候得共佛國ニテハ所謂約定税ト普通税トノ二種アルノミニテ即チ約定税則ヲ施行ノ約ヲ結ビ居候英獨國<sup>(イギリス)</sup>澳等ノ諸國ニ對シ一般ニ施行スル者ハ約定税ノ外無之然ルニ右ハ歐洲外國々ヘ對シ曾テ此利益ヲ與フル事ヲ許シタル前例無之候得共今般新條約取結候ニ付テハ佛國ヘ對シ約定税ヲ望ムハ互相ノ主義相當ノ事ト相考ヘ且將來我國商品モ約定税ヲ拂ヒ候様相成候ハミ利益不少ハ顯然ニ付前文ノ通約定税或ハ其他ノ税則ニテモ最低額ノ者ヲ施行候様致度旨及開談候事ニ御座候

右之趣一應申進置候敬具

明治十三年四月三十日

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二七八

二七七 明治十三年四月三十日 鮫島駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ト談判ノ經過報告ノ件

別信 第十一號 六月十五日到

條約重修事件ニ付先便申進置候通り去ル十六日當國外務卿ニ面接シ兼テ御降附ノ内達書ニ基キ半公ノ談判相開キ候件々ノ要領左ニ略陳致候

一 海關税則ハ別紙草案ノ如キ税目ニ改正シ之ヲ日本皇帝ヨリ布告シ且施行スルノ期限ヲ定メ其期限内ハ變更スル事ナカルヘシトノ旨別ニ約書ニ記載シ置ク事尤税額ヲ増加セントスルハ決シテ保護税主義ヲ主張スルニ非ス偏ニ財政上ノ困難ナル事情ニ由ルトノ事及貿易條約ノ義ハ新條約外ノ者ト致度事

一 日本在留佛國人民ニ施行スヘキ行政上ノ諸規則ハ佛公使ノ關涉ナク獨リ日本政府ニテ專制布告スル事

一 若シ此諸規則ヲ違犯スル佛國人アル時ハ日本官吏之ヲ處置スルノ區域ヲ立其權理ヲ施行スル事

一 新條約ハ期限ヲ立七ヶ年或ハ十ヶ年ヲ以テ期限トシ實施スル事

特命全權公使 鮫島 尙 信

外務卿井上馨殿

追テ本文ノ儀ハ全ク半公ノ談判ニテ元ヨリ拙者一己ノ見込ナリトシ開談致候次第ニ付只大主意ノミヲ辯シ候事ニ有之何レ詳細ノケ條ハ追テ公然タル訓令拜受致候上閣下ヨリノ訓令ナリトシ改テ公然委曲ノ談判ニ取懸リ可申積ニ罷在候此段申添候也

二七八 明治十三年六月三十日 井上外務卿ヨリ 鮫島駐佛公使宛

定約稅及普通稅併用ノ新方針ニ付訓令ノ件

鮫島公使別信案 第十六號

別信第十一號ヲ以條約重修事件ニ付任國外務卿ニ面接談判被致候要領<sup>(要領)</sup>透<sup>(透)</sup>條致閱悉候然ル處要領ノ第一項ニ海關稅則ハ日本皇帝ヨリ之ヲ布告シ其期限内變更セサル事ハ別ニ約書ニ記載置クヘシトノ一事ハ最前森公使ノ見込有之同公使ヨリモ直ニ御聞取且ハ拙者ヨリモ申進置候事ニ候得共近日ニ至リ同公使ヨリ申出ノ事情等彼是勘辨致候ニ最前ノ考案通りニテハ迪モ好結果ヲ得難ク被考候ヨリ改テ我政府ノ定議



ハ全體ノ改正ヲ本條約ト通商條約トノ二ツニ分チ海關稅則中ニモ亦定約稅ト普通稅トヲ區分シ定約稅ノ方ハ通商條約ニ付屬シ變方ノ承諾ヲ經サレハ本約ノ期限內ニ變更不致普通稅ノ方ハ通商條約ニ附屬セス全ク帝國ニ於テ某ノ額內ナレバ自由ニ上下スルノ權ヲ獨操スル主意ニ成相候間貴君ニモ此意ヲ被體任國外務卿ニ御談明可有之候此他ノ各項ハ貴君御陳述ノ如ク正シク我政府ノ意向ニ適當間然スル所無之満足ニ存候尙右ニ基キ御辯明有之度候也

註 1 前掲二七七文書ナルニ付參照

## 二七九

明治十三年月十五日

鯨島駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 新任公使ニ對スル佛國政府ノ訓令其他ニ關シ内報ノ件

内啓不相換御清康御勉務ノ條奉勸賀候陳者東京在留佛公使ロケツト義彌今便ヨリ赴任致候就テハ條約重修一件ニ關シタル事項ハ同人へ全權付與ノ都合ニ執可計旨過日外務卿ヨリ内話モ有之候事故兩三日前外務省政務局長へ内々其模様問合候處同局長申聞候ニハ「日本政府提出ノ改正案ニ付外

家ノ通習ナレハ同公使ノ言詞モ確信難致ニ付尙又昨日外務卿へ面晤シロケツトヘ付與ノ訓令ノ事押テ相尋候處同卿被申述候ニハ「今般差遣致候新公使へハ日佛兩國外交上ニ關シテハ充分ノ實意ヲ以兩國ノ裨益ニ相成候様周旋盡力スルハ元ヨリ申込モ無之殊ニ日本ハ東洋諸國開化進歩ノ率先者ニ付同國ノ意向ハ可成伸暢發達セシムヘキ様贊助ノ方法ニ注意勉強可致様トノ訓令ヲ付與致候」トノ趣ニ付尙又小生ヨリ「我條約重修ノ義ニ關シテハ如何様ノ訓令ヲ御付與相成候哉」トノ旨ヲ尋ネ候處同卿ヨリ「同人赴任ノ上實地ニテ相考候意見ヲ詳細報告可致様訓令ヲ與置候右ハ近日東方事件ニ付頗ル混雜シ多用ニ有之候爲メ未タ條約草案ニ關シ充分ノ取調出來不申且各國政府ノ意見及問合置候ヘ共未タ何レヨリモ回答無之依テ不得止右ノ訓令ノミ付與致候事ニ御座候尤同人ヨリ來報有之候上其模様ニ寄尙又明細ノ訓令權力ヲモ與ヘ可申積ニ有之候」トノ事ニ付更ニ小生ヨリ「ロケツト氏赴任相成候共我外務卿ト談判ヲ開カレスデハ實地格別ノ意見モ有之間敷様存候其邊ハ如何ニ候哉」ト相尋候處外務卿ヨリ「商議ノ權ハ元ヨリ同人ヘ付與致候ニ付同人東京着ノ上ハ速ニ談判相始メ可申候ヘ共只條約ノ約款

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二七九

國政府ノ意見及問合置候ヘ共未タ何ノ返答モ無之候間我政府ヨリ日本在留公使ヘ充分ノ訓令附與致候事難相成」トノ旨ニ有之依テ尙又商務局長へ内聞致候處同人ノ咄ニ「ロケツトヘハ日本到着ノ上自己ノ意見ヲ具シ報告可致様トノ訓令ヲ與ヘタルノミニ有之」トノ事ニテ詳細ノ事情不明ニ付更ニロケツトヲ錢別ノ爲メ夕食ニ招キ懇親ノ情ヲ以屹度ナク訓令ノ次第致内問候處同人申聞候ニハ「今般赴任ニ付我政府ヨリノ訓條ハ漠然タルモノニテ且拙者ノ權限甚少ク東京着任ノ上自分見込ヲ報告可致様トノ事ニ有之候愚考ニ者此度御提出ノ草案ニテハ到底談判結收ノ見込無御座候貴國ヨリ外國へ御請求ノケ條ヲ御申出相成候時ハ外國へ報復トシテ御讓與可被成事柄ヲモ併テ御開陳無之テハ無効ノ談判ニ時日ヲ費シ結局ニハ致リ兼ね申ト存候佛國新外務卿ハ眞ニ日本ヲ愛好シ此上モナキ厚意ヲ抱キ被居候間本國ニ對スル同人職掌上ノ義務ニ差響カサルタケハ日本ノ爲メ便益ヲ與ヘ候様充分盡力可被致事更ニ疑ナク於拙者モ勿論赴任ノ上ハ日本政府ノ爲メニ盡力勉強シ彼我ノ協議可相繼様周旋可致決心ニ罷在候」トノ事ニ有之候然ルニ自分ヘ付與ノ訓令ノ次第ヲ他ニ漏泄スル事ヲ嫌ヒ之ヲ正言セサルハ外交

ヲ決定シ且記名調印スルニ全權ハ未タ付與スル事不相叶候御存ノ通佛國ニテハ外國トノ條約書類ハ議院ノ議ニ附シ同院ノ允諾ヲ經サレバ結局ニ至ラサル者ニ付外國ニ比スレハ甚タ面倒ニ有之最初結約ノ節議院ノ允諾ヲ得ヘキ者ヤ否ヲ熟考致候上條約ヲ取結ヒ尤條約調印ノ者タリトモ議院ニテ異議アル時ハ實施スル事不相成故我政府ヨリ全權ヲ委任致候義ハ貴國ニ對シ御氣ノ毒ナカラ容易ニ難取計事情有之候此旨不惡御推察被下度候」トノ趣返答有之候依テ即今假令如何程全權委任ノ義ヲ佛政府ノミヘ相迫リ候共到底無効ノ事ト相考其内英獨等ノ見込モ相分リ可申ニ付先ツ右之談判ニテ當日ハ終リ置候

一ロケツトヨリハ充分日本ノ爲メ周旋盡力可致積ニ有之トノ旨申居候ヘ共其言詞ノ通全ク信用ハ難致候數年北京ニ在勤致居候事モ有之ニ付東洋人ヲ遇スルノ惡弊ニハ多少相慣レ居ヘク殊ニ現今在東京佛代理公使バロワー儀ハ兎角我政府ニ反背ノ情アリテ常ニ外務省ヘノ報告中我國ノ惡評ノミ掲記致候程ノ人物ニ候處不幸ニシテロケツトトハ年來ノ信友ニ有之様子ニ付同人東京着ノ際バロワーノ說ヲ聞キ多少其意向ニ浸潤シ終ニ我力爲メ不宜一人ト可相成哉モ難計候

得共右様ノ人物ニ相成候ヤ否ハ大ニ我ヨリノ待遇方ニ關係有之最初一度我ニ背クノ意ヲ生セシメハ再ヒ我良友ト致候義難事ニ付同人到着ノ際御交際上別テ御注意被降同人ヲシテ支那人ニ接シタル舊弊ヲ我國ニテ再出セシメス又パロワノ惡意ヲ將來ニ繼續セシメサル様ノ御仕向ニ相成候様偏ニ希望仕候

一 先般在東京英代理公使ケネデーへ條約草案書類御渡相成候後去ル七月八日付ヲ以同人ヨリ英外務省へ報告致候書翰ノ大略内々致承知候ニ付御含迄申上候即如左

井上外務卿ヨリ閣下可差進様トノ趣ヲ以被相渡候條約草案書類差出候右ハ可成速ニ閣下へ差進度存候ニ付明日發ノ郵便ヲ以遞送致候故於拙者ハ右書類ヲ篤ト檢閱致候時間無之候得共一應入念通讀致候處裁判權ノ義ニ付テハ當一月中前外務卿ソルスブリー侯へ内報致置候通井上君へ及陳述候次第モ有之同君ニハ最早此權理請求ノ義ハ着手不被致事ト存居候處此度ノ草案ニテ甚失望致候將又稅權ノ義ハ井上君ヨリ前以拙者へ内話被致候處トハ大分程度ヲ超へ過高ニ相成居候云々

今日迄ノ模様ハ先ツ右ノ通ニ御座候尙今後ノ事情ハ追々可

ニ在レハナリ。我政府ヨリ請求ノ件々佛政府ニテ取調相濟候ハ、其見込如何有之候哉致承知度且可成急速ロケツトヘ充分ノ全權委任相成候様執計果度旨申入候處商務局長ヨリノ答言大略如左

商務局長云云ニ是迄モ御面晤ノ節ニ致陳述候通貴政府ヨリ御請求相成候條件ヲ悉ク承諾ノ御返答ニ及度ハ元ヨリ拙者希望スル所ニシテ如此談判出來候場合ニ到候ハ、如何計愉快ニ可有之ト存候へ共拙者ノ職務上今日ノ處不面白模様ニ有之候段吐露セサルヲ得サルハ實ニ殘念ノ至ニ存候貴政府ヨリ御差出ノ稿本ヲ熟讀シ其件々ヲ沈思致候處乍殘念右ノ稿本ニ從ヒ之ヲ基礎トシ及御談判候事難相成哉ト存候右稿本ノ義ニ付テハ曾テパロワイヨリ差越候説明書モ有之參照ノ上貴政府御請求ノ主意ハ致了解候元來於我政府ハ貴國ノ爲メ充分ノ友情ヲ存シ何卒都合能結果ニ到リ候様取計度トノ望意ヲ抱キ居候へ共即今ノ勢ニテハ於拙者何様ノ事項タリトモ決定難致我政府ニテモロケツトヘ充分ノ全權委任ノ見込ハ未ダ相立兼候先當分ノ内ロケツトヨリノ報告到着ト各國政府へ曾テ及問合置候見込ミ回答トヲ待チ暫ク着手ノ義見合セ候積ニ御座候到

申進候敬具

明治十三年十月十五日

鮫島 尙 信

井上外務卿殿

二八〇 明治十四年二月十八日 鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

我提案ニ對スル佛國政府ノ態度内報ノ件

機密信 第四號

條約重修事件ニ付故鮫島公使逝去後佛政府ノ模様如何可有之哉過般内々佛外務省政務局長並商務局長迄及偵問候處故鮫島氏ヨリ已ニ内信ヲ以被申進候通於佛政府ハ東京在留公使赴任ノ上實地ノ事情ヲ親視シ其意見ヲ具シ報告可致答ニ付同人ヨリノ報告到着前ハ何様ノ事柄タリトモ先ツ決議相見合且他各國政府ト共ニ内議ヲ盡シ候上ナラテハ實際ノ著手ニ不及見込ナリトノ返答有之候然ルニ新任公使ロケツト義東京安著已ニ閣下ニモ御接見相成候趣新聞紙ニテ見受候ニ付同人ヨリ報告ノ次第モ可有之哉ト想察シ其模様探偵旁早速外務省商務局長ニ面會シ(本件ハ即今專ラ同人ノ手中

底拙者一己ノ愚考ニテハ今般御提出ノ條約書體裁ニテ如此件々ノ請求ヲ維持セラレ於日本商議スヘントノ御意見ヲ變セラレサル間ハ乍御氣之毒種々ノ異議差起リ兎角時日遷延ノ虞アリ之カ爲メ談判都合能抄取好結局ニ到ル事ハ無覺束哉ト存候云々

佛政府ニテ右様見込居候義ハ自ラ他政府ノ意見ニ左袒致居候哉ニモ被相察候最早不遠ロケツトヨリノ報告到着可致ニ付只今強テ充分ノ全權委任ノ義請求致候共其効有之間數ロケツトヨリノ報告到着致候上談判致候方可然ト相考先ツ右ノ談ニテ留置候

一 我政府ヨリ提出ノ約案ニ付歐洲諸國連合同一ノ回答ヲ爲サントスルヤノ勢有之様子過日略ホ傳承致候事有之候處兩三日前アダムスヨリマルシヤルハ極密ノ内話ニ「此度英政府ヨリ覺書ヲ各國政府ニ廻シ其同意ヲ要シ同一ノ回答ヲ日本政府へ與ヘントノ見込有之右機密回文ノ草案英外務省ヨリアダムスヘ下付相成同人見込可申出様トノ内達有之候然ルニ此書類ハ極密ナルヲ以當分ノ内其詳細ヲ他言スル事不相叶候へ共其大意ハ日本政府ノ請求ヲ抗拒ノ意味ニ有之候尤何レ添削スヘキモノニ付已ニ自分ヨ

リモ右書中改正ヲ要スル件々申立置候到底多少ノ改正ヲ加ヘ候共日本ノ爲メニハ不宜書付ニ有之候トノ趣内話有之候就テハ此覺書出來ノ上ハ各國政府ヘ回送可相成ニ付佛政府ヘ到達候ハ、其機ヲ怠ラス早速右覺書ノ主意竝右覺書ニ關シ佛政府ノ見込詳細探偵ヲ遂ケ可申進候今日迄ノ事情一應御含迄致内陳度如此ニ御座候敬具

明治十四年一月廿八日

臨時代理 鈴木貫一

外務卿井上馨殿

註 1 明治十三年十二月四日鯨島公使任地ニ於テ薨去

2 此ノ時代ノ公信ニハ公使又ハ代理公使ノ官印ナク單ニ署名(自署又ハ代筆)ノミナルモ稀ニハ私印ヲ押捺シタルモノアリ

二八一 明治十四年三月五日

鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

### 我提案ニ對スル各國ノ態度内報ノ件

機密信 第七號

過便申進置候我條約重修事件ニ付英國外務省ニテ取調ノ回答覺書出來シ已ニ内閣ノ同意ヲモ經タル後當地在留同國大

シムルノ勢力無之候バークス義ハ當分滯英シ歐洲各國政府於テ英政府ヨリ差出シタル覺書ノ主義ニ根基シ同旨趣ノ回答ヲ日本政府ヘ贈リ候日ヲ待チ其上ニテ歸任致スヘキ内意ニ可有之哉トノ説ヲ承リ候蘭政府ヨリ特ニ海軍士官一名ヲ東京ニ派遣シ召還相成候蘭公使事件ヲ更ニ實地ニ就キ取調候様可相成哉ノ内話有之候ケネデ一義ハ餘リ日本量眞ニ片倚り過キタリトノ評判有之同人所行ハ英外務省中ニテ満足不致人々モ有之由ニ候

即今一般ノ形況致承知候分先ツ右ノ通ニ有之歐洲各國連合同一ノ意向ニ出候義ハ我不利ト相成候ニ付願クハ此政略ヲ破リ候様精々盡力可致候殊ニ佛政府ノ義ハ充分周旋シ我國ノ爲メ信友タルノ實行ヲ顯ハサシメ候様致度希望罷在候英政府ヨリノ覺書ハ入手相叶候ハ、早速寫取差進メ可申且右ニ關シタル各國政府ノ見込ヲモ偵問ノ上追々可申進候得共右ノ趣一應御含迄内陳イタシ候敬具

明治十四年二月廿五日

臨時代理 鈴木貫一

外務卿井上馨殿

使ヘ本日致到達候様子就テハ近日中歐洲各國政府ヘ夫々差出候都合ニ可相成ト察シ候右覺書中記載ノ事柄過日來探偵致居候ヘ共極密ニ屬スルヲ以テ未タ委敷不相分大意ハ「此度日本政府ヨリ提出アリシ條約草案ニ依レハ日本政府ノ請求ハ五相ノ主義ニ非ス日本ヨリ過多ノ事項ヲ要需シ其報酬トシテ諸外國ニ許與スヘキ事無之甚不相當ノ事也」トノ旨趣ヲ論述シ他各國ヲシテ其理由ニ服シ以テ我請求ニ應セシメサルノ方法ヲ施シ候様子ニ有之獨逸ハ即今專決獨行ニ及ハス英國ト協議ノ上同様ノ處置ニ出ツヘキ見込ニ相聞ヘ候佛國ハ何レノ方向ニ決スヘキヤ未タ確ト不相分候得共多分英國ノ見込ニ協同可致哉ノ模様有之候今日ノ勢ニテハ歐洲中ニテ我國ニ對シ特ニ友情ヲ抱キ都合能相運候様周旋セントノ底意アル國ナキニ非サレトモ奈何セン大陸連立ノ國勢安穩ナラサルニ依リ東洋一國ニ關スル事件ノ爲メ歐洲中ニ近接セル強國ノ親情ヲ損シ候様ノ事有之テハ即チ自國ノ不利ニ付大抵英獨兩國ノ政略ニ左袒シ斷然獨行ニ及ヒカタキ内情アルヲ免レサル姿ニ有之候只露國ノミハ全ク孤立ニテ同政府ノ意見如何タル事ハ於各國承知不致様子ニ候ヘ共到底同政府ノ獨行ハ大陸諸國ヲ誘ヒ其意想ヲ一變シ之ニ同意セ

二八二 明治十四年三月四日

鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

### 英國政府ノ廻狀ニ關スル件

附屬書 十四年三月二日發鈴木代理公使來電

英國政府ヨリ條約改正ノ義ニ付佛蘭政府ヘ照會ノ件

機密信 第八號

先便申進候我條約重修ノ件ニ關シ英政府ヨリ我締盟各國ヘ照會ノ義ハ去月廿六日當府在留英大使ヨリ其本國政府下命ノ通佛外務卿ヘ及照會候様子傳承候故右書類致一覽度望意ヲ以百方遂探偵候ヘ共頗ル秘密ニ取扱居候故未タ入手不相叶候乍去内々其大意ヲ承リ候ニ付不取敢別紙寫ノ通電信ヲ以申進候段御詳知ノ事ト存候右書中所言ニ據レハ「於英國ハ條約改正ノ義ハ承諾セリト雖モ今日現存ノ諸約款ヲ悉皆廢棄スル事ハ之ヲ肯スル能ハス日本政府ヨリ請求ノ事項ハ外國人ノ權理ニ關スル程度過大ニシテ而其報酬トシテ外國ヘ許與スヘキ事ハ發言アラス互相ノ主義ニ背キ甚不相當也到底日本ヨリ提出アリシ草案ハ商議ノ本ト爲シ得ベキ者ニ非ス云々ノ旨ヲ論述シ且各國政府於テモ英國ニ同意シ日本

ニ贈ルニ同一ノ回答ヲ以テセン事ヲ慾瀾ノ主意ニ有之候就  
テハ佛政府ハ此照會ニ付如何ノ見込ニ有之候哉致承知度早  
速外務省中ノ模様承リ合候處商務局長ノ内話ニ據レハ「英  
國ヨリノ照會落手已來未タ日數モ無之ニ付何分ノ見込不相  
立候尤各國政府ノ意向ヲモ承リ候上ナラテハ決議不致事ト  
存候ヘ共自分一巳ノ想像ニテハ多分英國ヨリノ相談ニ協同  
致候様可相成ト存候在日本佛官員ヨリ外人ノ裁判ハ未タ日  
本政府ヘ附托スヘカラサル實狀アリトノ旨會テ報告モ有之  
ニ付稅額増加ノ義ハ別段異議有之間敷候得共裁判權ニ關係  
ノ事項ハ御氣ノ毒ナカラ承諾難致ト存候」トノ趣申居候  
一 前文ノ通英政府ヨリ各國ヘ照會有之候ニ付ヘックス義  
ハ尙ホ潛英シ各政府ヨリノ回答ヲ待チ其模様ニ依リ又々  
赴任可致内意ニ有之トノ趣致傳承候  
右御含迄一應申進候尙今後ノ模様ハ近々可申進候敬具

明治十四年三月四日

臨時代理 鈴木貫一

外務卿井上馨殿

附屬書

十四年三月二日發鈴木公使代理來電

(英國政府ヨリ條約改正ノ義ニ付佛國政府(照會ノ件))

Minister Inouye

Tokio

British Government sent last week confidential circular on treaty revision to France and the other Powers arguing that Japanese Government claims large limitation of foreigner's right, but offers no reciprocal concessions. It says that, England feels disposed to revise but will not abrogate, and asks Powers to join together to express this. Taken as a whole, circular implies rejection of our proposals. The English Minister is to remain at home for the present.

March 2<sup>nd</sup> 1881.

Souzouke (sic)

二八三 明治十四年五月六日

鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛國代理公使ノ報告書ニ關スル件

機密信 第十二號

曾テ我國在留佛代理公使バローノヨリ昨年七月中新條約案

二八四 明治十四年六月三日

鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ノ回答督促ノ件

機密信 第十四號

ノ事ニ付閣下ト對話ノ始末并同人實地ノ意見四十葉餘ノ長  
文ヲ以佛政府ヘ致報告候趣ハ其頃傳聞致居候處去月下旬佛  
政府ヨリ右ノ一書外二通ノ書翰添英政府參考ノ爲メ密ニ及  
通知候赴ニ御座候就テハ右書翰ハ我政府ニ對シ不友情ノ主  
旨ナルハ顯然ニ候ヘ共書中記載ノ件々確知シ辯解及度存意  
ニテ間接直接ノ手段ヲ以偵問ヲ盡シ候得共極テ秘密ニ附シ  
置候様子ニテ入手不相叶殘念ニ存候尤他國政府ヘ致通知候  
哉否ハ難相分唯英政府ノ方ノミ確實ニ致承知候若シ貴地ニ  
テ佛公使ヘ御談判ノ節右邊ノ義御問試ノ都合ニ相成候ハ  
同公使答言ノ模様早々御内報被降度候  
一 過般英政府ヨリ照會ノ回答催促兩回マテ佛政府ヘ申來  
リ候處於佛政府ハ其大意ハ異議無之候得共回答ノ書翰ハ  
此節多事取込中ニ付暫ク遲延可致トノ旨一應及返答候様  
子ニ御座候  
右御考量迄申進候敬具  
明治十四年五月六日  
臨時代理 鈴木貫一  
外務卿井上馨殿

明治十四年六月三日

臨時代理 鈴木貫一

外務卿井上馨殿

二八五 明治十四年七月二十日 鈴木駐佛臨時代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

條約重修會議歐地開催意見ニ關スル件

機密信 第二十號

條約改正ノ件ハ歐地ニ於テ御談判相成候方可然旨在我佛獨  
兩公使ヨリ段々中立我政府ニモ御同意ニ可相成模様在東京  
外國人ヨリ内報候次第傳聞仕候右ハ故鯨島公使ヨリモ曾テ  
十一年及十二年中機密第四號五號ヲ以被申進候通り大陸中  
ニテ談判相關キ候方大ニ利益有之様相考候譯ハ

第一在我外商等私意ヲ主張シ公使ノ議論ヲ動カス等ノ弊  
ナク

第二公使等本國ニ歸リ商議ニ參與候ヘトモ慢ニ我意ヲ伸  
ル事叶間敷

第三我ヨリ彼政府ノ議ヲ左右スル間接ノ手段モ不尠  
旁以テ歐地ニ於テ會議御開ノ方速カニ結局ノ場合ニ可至ト

我條約案拒否ノ對策ニ關スル件

附屬書 十四年十一月五日發井田公使來電

機密信 三十一號

我條約重修ニ付拙者着巴以來見聞探偵ノ次第且過日渡英イ  
タシ森公使ト面談ノ末歐洲近況ニ付見込相添御參考ノ爲左  
ニ申進候

英政府ヨリ我提出ノ條約案ヲ却セシニ付當今我ヨリ施ベ  
キ政略ヲ熟考スルニ二策アリ

第一 我條約案ヲ飽迄維持シ我ヨリ勸ル東京豫議會同ヲ  
拒斥スル

第二 該會同ニ付談判ノケ條ハ彼我互相ノ承諾ヲ得ルニ  
至ラント豫期シ東京豫議會同ヲ許諾スル事

當地及英國ニテ見聞イタシ候實景ニ由リ勘考スレハ第二策  
ヲ取ルニ利アリト存候

抑今度ノ改正ハ我ニ増益アリテ彼ニ損失アルハ明了ニ候故  
彼改正ヲ好ズ事ヲ左右シ遷延セントスルハ彼ノ情實ナレト  
モ我請求ノ必要ナルト正理ナルトニ對シ止ヲ得ス彼等終ニ  
東京會議ヲ申出シ候事ユヘ我若シ該會議ヲ拒斥セハ却テ彼  
ニ好辭柄ヲ造與スルニナリ夫ニヨリ彼或ハ改正ヲ辭スルモ

存候間御熟考有之候様致シ度右廟議御決定ノ上ハ可成速カ  
ニ御内示被降度希候

佛政府ニ於テハ自國ニテ開議致度旨兼テ中居故鯨島公使ヨ  
リモ被申立置候通ニ御座候得其他ノ政府ニテハ或ハ之ヲ異  
議スルモ難計哉ニ承リ候ニ付彌々商議ノ場所歐洲ニ被爲移  
候事ニ決シ候ハ、其旨縮盟諸政府ト可成速カニ御照會有之  
様致度存候

當國ニテハ「チユニ」及アルジェリ等ノ事件ニ付頗ル多  
事ニ有之我條約重修ノ件ニ付テハ去六月中申進候後別段變  
リタル容子無之英政府ノ廻文ニ對シ返答モ未ダ不差立趣ニ  
相聞候種々探偵ヲ盡候得共一體本件ニ付テハ獨逸政府ヨリ  
甚ダ内密ヲ主トシ候趣ニテ兎角各政府間往復ノ模様料知難  
致候尙此上追々事情探リ可申進候敬具

明治十四年七月廿二日

臨時代理 鈴木貫一

外務卿井上馨殿

註 1 寺島外務卿時代一卷三七三參照

二八六 明治十四年十一月十一日 井田駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

亦計ガタシ

東京會議ノ時ニ當リ得失ヲ概計スレハ我請求ヲ満足スルニ  
足サルガ如シト雖モ退テ之ヲ考レハ今度ノ改正ニ付得ル處  
ノ利益ハ假令最初希望ノ點ニ十分達セズトモ我ヨリ彼ニ讓  
渡スルモノニ輕重ヲ比較セハ我ニ得ル處ノ利益ハ必一層大  
ナルヘシ

今度裁判權回復ノ義ハ覺東ナク存候得共關稅ヲ増加シ行政  
警察ノ一部分ヲ復據スル義ハ各國共許諾スヘキ内意ト察セ  
ラレ候將又今後ノ條約ハ短期ニシ我實地ノ景況ニ應シ屢々  
之ヲ改正スルモ各國共異論有マジク存候故新條約ハ成丈期  
限ヲ短縮シ五年乃至七年ニテ改正スヘキノ明文ヲ條約面ニ  
記載有之度候

右様ノ譯故今度我請求ヲ十分達ル能ズトモ到底得益ハ我ニ  
アレハ斷然東京會議ヲ承諾シ僅々ノ進歩ニ止ルトモ先以一  
旦改正ノ局ヲ結フニ御注目有之度候

佛政府見込ハ今便前以申進候程ノ事無之候同政府ハ兎角獨  
乙政府ノ意見ニ同意ノ姿ニテ格別變リ候義ナク尤去月廿八  
日ヨリ兩議院會議ヲ開キチユニス國へ出兵ノ事ニ付議員等  
政府ノ處置ヲ質問シ頗ル政府中混雜ニテ不日内閣一變スベ

キ模様ニ候

東京會議ニ付各國ヨリ我ニ許同スル若干又彼ヨリ我ニ要求スル條件等承知致度油斷ナク探偵イタシ居候得共何分豫知イタシ難ク歐洲諸國ニ於テモ或ハ右ニ付確乎タル定議ハ未無之シテ開議判談ノ上各公使ヨリ本國政府へ上申致候事乎ト察ラレ候尙追々探偵ノ模様次便可申進候

右ニ付去ル五日別紙寫ノ通り電信差立候付御落手ト存候  
右件々申進候也

明治十四年十一月十一日

特命全權公使 井 田 讓

外務卿井上馨殿

附屬書

十四年十一月五日發井田公使來電

Gaimukio

I have seen Mori and found that he has advised you to withdraw draft of treaty revision.<sup>1</sup> But judging from the present European situation I am desirous of suggesting that you do nothing at all and wait for expression intentions foreign Powers.

Ida

臣未タ知ラサルノ事ヲ外國政府カ其使臣ノ報告ニ依テ我ヨリモ先中ニ聞知致ス様ノ事有之候テハ嘗ニ我使臣ニ慙愧難忍ノ心ヲ懷カシムルノミナラス外人ニ對テハ我交際ノ組織整ハス我政府ハ在外使臣ヲ信用セス國家ノ利害ニ參與セシメサルノ觀察ヲ與ウヘキ場合ニ當リ從テ事務ノ進捗ニモ大ナル影響ヲ及ホシ甚不都合ノ事ニ有之候間實際上ノ事件希クハ諸外國ト同一ノ方法ヲ採リ在外使臣ニ充分ノ信用ヲ與ヘ訓令ヲ下シ國家ノ爲メ飽迄奔走セシムル様篤ト御注意有之度切ニ致希望候

一 今般條約重修ニ付各國政府ハ其使臣ニ充分ノ全權委任ヲ與ヘサル趣ニ有之候左スレハ東京ニ於テ會議相開キ候末重修ノケ條ヲ討議スルモ其權限ヲ超過スルケ條ハ逐一本國政府ノ意見ヲ問ハサルヲ得サル事ト相考候然レハ我國益々大關係アル條約ノケ條ヲ我ト共ニ確定スル者ハ在東京外國ノ使臣ニ非スシテ各國ノ政府ニ有之事ト存候此場合ニ於テ各國政府ニ我ノ意見ヲ述ヘ我ヲ利スヘキ様ニ奔走勉力スルハ今日最緊要ノ事ニシテ即チ鄙官等在外使臣ノ急務ト信候  
一 外務省ニ於テ外國使臣ト要件ヲ談判ノ後ニハ談判ノ事柄ニ付使臣ノ考如何ヲ尋ネ且ツ使臣ヨリ其本國政府へ電報

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二八七

5 November 1881.

註 1 同年九月九日附森公使來信二三文書參照

二八七

明治十四年三月十六日

井田駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

條約重修事務取扱方ノ件

外交上ノ關係ハ大小トナク在外使臣へ御通知相成義甚肝要ニ付機密信第三十四號ヲ以テ既ニ愚見ヲ致略陳候得共仍熟考ニ涉リ候得ハ我今日ノ景況ニ於テ愈緊要ノ事ト致確信候ニ付重復ヲ願ミス數件左ニ致縷陳候希クハ閣下篤ト御思考被下度候

一 諸外國交際ノ組織ハ本省ト其使臣トノ告知等ニ至ル迄萬端整頓致居ルノミナラス使臣多クハ老練博識ノ人ニシテ自然威光モ備リ居旁事務ノ抄取モ速ニ有之候得共我國外交ノ組織ハ未タ完全ニ無之老練熟達ノ者モ僅少ニ有之從テ我在外使臣ノ位置ハ他國使臣ノ位置ニ劣リ其威光ノ薄弱ナルハ閣下モ素ヨリ御悉知通ノ事ニ有之我在外ノ使臣ニシテ其位置卑ク遙カニ他ニ劣リ居ルノ感覺ヲ不起者ハ有之間敷存候此際若シ我政府ヨリ在外使臣ニ精細報告スル事ナク我使

又ハ書翰ヲ以テ通知スヘキ大略ヲ問ヘハ使臣ハ之レニ應ジ通知スヘキ主意ヲ略述スル事外交上ノ恒例ニ有之候義ハ閣下御悉知通ノ事ニ有之候若シ彼ヨリ其本國ニ通知スル主意我爲メニ不利ヲ可生カ又ハ困難ヲ可來カノ怖レ有之時ハ直チニ電報ヲ以談話ノ結果ヲ在外使臣ニ知ラシメ事ニ由テハ任國政府へ辯駁可致様御示令被下度候

一 諸國政府ハ其使臣ノ報告ヲ信認シ夫レニ依テ使臣在留國ノ景況ヲモ裁斷スル事ニ有之候得ハ彼ノ報告中ニ我ニ不利ノ事柄アリ又ハ事實ニ違居ル義ト想像致ス事有之候テモ本省通知且ツ示令モ無之候テハ彼ノ誤謬ヲ咎ムヘキ證據ナク我權理ノ枉屈ヲ暢伸セシムルノ路モ相絶ヘ空ク誤謬ヲ信視セシムル義ニ付此點ニモ能々御注意被下度候

一 外國使臣ハ如何程我ニ厚意懇親ノ色ヲ現ハシ候テモ我在外使臣カ自ラ邦家ノ爲メラ慮リ其職ニ執掌スル如クナラサル義ハ明瞭ノ事ニ有之候希クハ在外使臣ヲ充分ニ信用シ之レニ訓令ヲ與ヘテ事ヲ爲サシメ公務ノ情勢ヲ詳カニ通知シ邦家ノ爲メニ飽迄奔走セシメ遣外使臣ノ名實被並行候様篤ト御注意御實行被成度懇願ノ至ニ候

右件々ハ甚要用ト相考候ニ付閣下ノ御參考迄ニ不取敢致開

九〇五

陳候敬具

明治十四年十二月十六日

註 本信ニハ發信者受信者名共ニ記載無之モ井田公使發井上外務卿宛ノモノナリ

二八八

明治十四年二月三日 井田駐佛公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

條約改正ニ對スル歐洲諸國ノ態度ニ關スル件

一 拙者着任以來公使館ノ公書類致通覽候處鈴木書記官以下ノ勉強ニテ大ヒニ整頓致シ居仕合ニ候右公書ヲ大別スルニ甲ハ國文ノ往復書翰報告等乙ハ歐文ノ書類報告書覺書等ニ有之歐文ノ分ハ當府ヘ公館設立以來十年ノ間タ重モニ「マルシヤル」ノ筆セシ行政經濟交際等ノ事柄ニテ拙者ニモ時々致參考候處大ヒニ要用ノ書類ニ有之候然レトモ今日我レニ直接ノ關係アル條約重修上ノ事柄ニ無之候故委細ハ玆ニ開陳不致候

一 其他專ラ條約重修ニ關係ノ英佛文書類有之是ハ諸國歐人ト「マルシヤル」ト我重修事件ヲ談話ノ後一々其覺書ヲ認メ鯨島等ヘ報告セシ者ニ有之拙者ニモ其大略ヲ譯述致サ

趣ト察セラレ候

一、日本條約上ノ權理ハ日本一國ニテ拾捨スル能ハス歐洲ト締結セシ條約ユエ歐洲ノ權理モ亦輕視ス可ラス

一、歐洲諸國カ東洋ニ對スル數十年來ノ連合政治ハ一朝ニシテ悉ク豹變スル能ハス日本條約ノ重修ハ一國ニ係ル事ニ非スシテ歐洲全國ニ關係ス日本モ亦宜シク此情實ヲ察セサル可ラス

一、歐洲諸國カ慣用スル數十年來ノ連合政治ヲ一新スルニハ東洋諸國中ニテ日本ヲ以テ第一先キニスヘキ事明瞭ナレトモ是モ漸次ニ爲スヘキ事ニシテ一時俄カニ爲シ得ルト望ム可ラス

一、日本ハ條約重修期限ヲ短ク定メ今度ハ歐人モ相當トスル溫和ノ重修ヲ承諾ス可シ一時ニ過度ノ請求ヲ成ストモ行ハレ難シ

右四條ノ主意ハ一年以來「マルシヤル」ヨリノ報告ニモ屢々相見得拙者ニモ是レ全ク歐洲ノ實情ト致信用候ニ付御參考ニ供シ候飽迄我草案ヲ維持セント主張スル義ハ得策ニ有之間敷存候今回ノ重修ニハ溫和ノ請求ヲ爲シ時機ヲ失ハス

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二八九

セ候處七十一年以來巴里及ヒ「ブリュクセル」邊ニ於テ歐人カ我カ重修ニ付談話セシ事共大抵被聞知候

右談話中ニハ歐人カ我所望ニ抵抗シ又ハ我請求ヲ非難スル言詞モ有之候得共其全體ヲ總括致シ候得ハ彼ハ我ニ厚意アリ成丈ハ我カ請求ニ應シ我ヲ進歩セシメント希望スル意味ハ充分ニ相見得尤佛白兩國ガ我國ノ爲メ懇親ノ意ヲ有シ居候義ハ右談話中ノ語氣ニ充分現ハレ居候

一 然ルニ八十年ノ七月我ヨリ條約重修草案ヲ提出致候處歐人大ヒニ不平ヲ懷キ過日ノ懇親モ忽チ消滅ノ姿ニ相成同年ノ秋巴里及ヒ「ブルユクセル」ニ於テノ談話中ニハ我ニ對スル過激ノ語氣モ相見得居候其後二三ヶ月ヲ經テ談話ノ語詞ハ少ク穩ニ相成タル趣ニ候得共我ヨリ提出ノ草案ニ全ク不同意ノ話ハ不斷有之候様子ニ相見得候

一 當年ノ初メニ條約重修ノ會議ヲ東京ニ可開ノ議起リ候處歐洲カ我ニ對スル厚意モ復タ漸々増加スル模様ニテ今日ハ可成リ懇親ノ景況ニ立至リ候

一 條約重修ノ義ニ付是迄ノ情勢ヲ觀察スルハ今後東京會議ノ爲メニモ最モ有益ノ事ト相考ヘ右書類等ニ據リ歐洲カ我ニ對スルノ實情ヲ熟考致候得ハ彼ヨリ陳述ノ大意ハ左ノ

速ニ締結シ嗣後重修ノ期ヲ五ヶ年位ニ定メ置キ漸ヲ以テ我權理ヲ悉ク回復スル様致度希望候

明治十四年十二月廿三日

註 發信者受信者名共ニ記載無之モ井田公使ヨリ井上外務卿ニ宛テタルモノナリ

二八九

明治十五年七月二十日 井田駐佛公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

「ルイ」氏談話概要報告ノ件

附屬書 十五年七月四日ルイ氏談話概略

九月二日到

顧問格「マルシヤル」ト政務副長亞細亞事務掛リ「ルイ」氏ト過日談話致シ候趣申聞ケ聊カ御參考ニモ可相成義ト考ヘ候ニ付別紙翻譯差上候間右得貴意候敬具

明治十五年七月廿一日

在 佛

特命全權公使 井 田 讓

外務卿井上馨殿

附屬書

(十五年七月四日ルイ氏談話概略)

本年七月四日我顧問格「マルシヤル」ト佛外務省政務副長亞細亞事務掛リ「ルイー」氏ト外務省ニ於テ談話ノ概略

マルシヤル

余レ長ク西班牙ニ旅行此頃歸巴セリ相變ラス君ノ健康ナルヲ見テ余レ甚タ悦ブ今日面會ノ序ニ東京會議上ニ付キ君ノ感覺如何ナルヤヲ聞ク事ヲ得バ余ニ於テ幸甚ナランルイ

余レニハ未タ如何ナル感覺モナシ、九冊ノ會議錄ト我官員ノ東京來翰ハ一讀シタレトモ、會議未タ抄取ラサルニヘ其結局ニ付キ今日ヨリ豫メ見込ヲ付ケル事甚タ難シ、又會議ニテ明白ニ決定セシケ條モ未タ渺シ井上卿ガ發議セシ開國ノ事ハ重要ノ問題ナレトモ如何シテ開國スルヤ其細目ヲ未タ知ラザレハ其方法ハ我レニ利アルベキヤ或ハ不利アルベキヤヲ知ラス開國ノ方法ニ付キ君ハ何カ委ク知ル事アルヤ

マルシヤル

余レ全ク知ラス余カ知リ居ル事ハ頗ル舊聞ニ屬ス日本ハ

テ今日ニ初マルニ非ス、君ト今日公ケトナリ内々談話スル目的ハ他ニアラス我カ改正上ニ付キ君等ノ感覺如何ナルヤヲ知ンガ爲メナリ、君ハ日本政府ガ裁判權ノ回復ト同時ニ開國セント要求ストモ其事行ハレ難ク思考スト述ヘラレタリ左レバ改正上ニ付キ君ガ現今ノ感覺ハ如何ナルヤヲ余レ聞キ得タリ、乍併余レ數年以來君ノ先役諸君ニ向ヒ(僅カニ二三ヶ月君ノ職位ニ居リシ人トハ談議スルノ機會莫カリシト雖トモ)常ニ同一ノ論旨ヲ以テ談議セシニ、何レモ最初ハ君ト同様ノ見込ナリシガ談議ヲ重ヌルニ從ヒ次第ニ見込ヲ變ラレ、遂ニハ「佛國ハ日本裁判權ヲ承諾スルニ至ル事有ル可シト」明言スル迄ニ至ラレタリ、而シテ先役諸君モ一説ヲ起シ、佛人民日本法律ニ從ヒ内地ニ居住セント自ラ望出ル者アラバ佛政府ハ其願ヲ許諾ス可シト論スルニ至リシ

マルシヤル

余ハ此局ニ於テ其談話書類ノ跡形ヲモ見タル事ナシ勿論其跡形ナシ、又跡形ノ在ル道理ナシ、是義ハ半私半公ノ談議ニシテ全ク相互ノ理論ニ過キザリシ、公然之レ

開國ヲ望ミ居レトモ諸各國ガ日本法律ニ服從セサル以上ハ決シテ開國ヲ許ルサ、ル事日本政府ノ見込ナリト先公使鮫島君ヨリモ屢々聞キシ事アリ外人日本法權ニ從ハサレバ開國ノ事決テ成ル可ラストノ趣ヲ同君ハ常ニ余レニ話サレタリ其頃余レ屢々爰ニ來リ君ノ先役諸君ト日本ノ事ヲ談セシ時モ日本ヘ對スル諸國ノ法權區域ヲ廣ムル能ハサル事又諸國ガ其人民ノ利益ヲ計ント欲セバ何故ニ日本内地ノ法律ニ服從スルヲ許ルサ、ルヤ、各國政府ガ之ヲ許サ、ルハ不當且ツ癡拙ナリト余レ自ラ信シテ常ニ其說ヲ主張シタリ

ルイ

佛國ハ斯ル點迄讓與スル能ハサルベシ、日本政府ガ斯クノ如キ約束ヲ以テ開國セント欲ストモ其義ハ現今行ハレサルベシ、然レドモ井上君ガ東京會議ヘ通知セシ文中ニ新舊移轉ノ時裁判權云々ノ語アリ、君其大略ノ意味ヲ我レニ通スルヲ得ベキヤ

マルシヤル

余レ其細目ヲ知ラサレバ君ニ之ヲ通スル能ハス然レトモ改正ノ事ニ付キ余カ知リ居ル事ハ既ニ君ニ述ベシ如ク敢

テ論議スベキ訓令ハ鮫島氏モ携ヘ居ラレザリシ故余レニモ其訓令ヲ與ルヲ得ラレザリシ然レトモ同氏ハ佛政府ノ官員ニ我カ主意ヲ述ベキ機會アラバ我カ主意ノ正統ナル事ヲ認可セシムルニ注意シ我カ裁判權ヲ回復シ開國セントノ發議ヲ諸國政府カ拒絕スルハ甚タ條理ナキヲ辯解シ置キ、他日我政府ヨリ此議ヲ發言スル時ノ爲メニ是可シト余レニ常々話サレタリ、依テ余レハ常ニ此論ヲ主張セシニ遂ニハ君ノ先役諸君モ我カ論ノ正當ナルヲ見認メ敢テ辯駁スルヲ得ラレザリシ事余レニ於テ満足ヲ覺エシ、就中現今在清公使タル「ブーレー」氏ハ三年餘五ニ辯論ノ末全ク余ト同說ニナリ、日本裁判所ガ佛人ニト死刑ヲ申渡タル時ニ限リ其裁判ヲ佛國裁判ニ控訴スベキ特權ヲ與ヘハ其他ハ悉ク日本法權ニ服從スルトモ少シモ苦シカラスト云ウ迄ニ至レリ、君ノ見ル如ク此談論ハ今日ニ初マルニ非ス、而シテ諸氏ガ間々我論ヲ可視シタル事アルモ亦君ニ述ヘシ如シ、余レ日本公使館ニ使ル事將サニ拾一年其内佛外務省官員屢々更改アリシ故余レハ更改セシ其人入ト據ナク同一ノ論旨ヲ初ヨリ繰返シテ主張セサルヲ得ザリシ、若シ君此事ヲ論スルヲ欲セバ君ニ向テモ亦我カ



説ヲ主張セン、而シテ君ノ先役諸君ノ見込ヲ變ヘシメシ如ク君ノ見込ヲモ亦變スルニ至ルヲ得ント余レハ希望スルイ

他日又タ君ノ説ヲ聞ント欲ス、余レハ休暇ヲ得テ明日ヨリ旅行八月ニ歸巴スル筈ナリ、歸巴ノ頃ニハ井上君ノ開國案細目ヲ入手スベシ、其細目ヲ見テ後チ我カ感覺ヲモ亦君ニ談スベシ

マルシヤル

重大ノ問題ハ開國ノ日於テ外國裁判權ヲ廢棄スベキ一事ナリ、君ヨク知ル如ク日本ハ月日ト共ニ開明ニ進ム、將來日本ガ條約ヲ改正スルノ時外國裁判權ヲ廢棄セント請求スベキハ至當ノ事ト君モ思考セラルベシ

ルイ

此義ニ付テハ君余レニ辯解スルヲ要セス、余ハ日本ノ新律ヲ實施シ果シテ能ク適應スルノ證ヲ得バ佛國ハ其裁判權ヲ拋棄スベシト確信ス、余レハ日本ト他ノ東洋諸國ヲ決シテ同視セス、日本ニ對シテハ他ノ東洋諸國ニ對シ爲サ、ルノ事ヲモ爲サント欲ス、佛國ト土國トノ關係ハ政事上ト裁判上トニ在リ、日本ニ對シテハ政事上ノ關係ナ

テ佛法權ノ下ニ置クラ拒ミ相互希望ノ並行ヲ遂ケ難クセン事ヲ恐ル

マルシヤル

余モ佛政府ガ其裁判權ヲ保持セント言張り相互ノ希望ヲ遂ケ難クセン事ヲ恐ル、日本ハ各國ニ利益アル讓與ヲ發議シ、充分ノ好意ヲ以テ條約ヲ改正セント欲スル事ハ君ガ能ク知ル如シ、余レ思ウニ日本政府ハ井田公使ニ細目ヲ談議スベキ訓令ヲ遺ル事アラン、其節ハマタ詳カニ君ト談議セン、今日相互ノ會話ハ全ク公事ノ性質ヲ帶ヒス、井田公使ハ會議ノ事ニ付キ君ノ感覺ヲ聽ント望ミ居ラレタリ、君談話シテ余レニ之レヲ示サレシ事感謝ニ堪ヘス、君カ旅行シテ歸巴スル時分ニハ日本ノ訓令ヲモ得テ復タ君ト委シク談論スル時機アラント希望ス

## 二九〇

明治十五年七月 日 井田駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

### アダムス氏談話ノ大要内報ノ件

附屬書 十五年七月 日 アダムス氏談話要略

別紙「アダムス」ノ談話等傳聞ニ付尙「マルシヤル」ヘモ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二九〇

シ、日本新律ノ實行ヲ見テ議院ガ佛民ハ日本裁判ニ服從シテ安寧ヲ享ケラル、ノ時機既ニ來リシト公言スルヲ得ベキニ至ラバ佛國ハ日本ニ對スル裁判權ヲ自ラ廢棄スベキ事余レ疑ヲ容レス、乍併此點迄ニ達スルニハ新律成就ヲ要スルノミナラス尙其他ニ要スベキ者アル事ハ君モ注意セラルベシ、新律成就ヲ要シ、新律ノ施行ヲ要シ、施行ノ上ヘ民心ニ適應スルヲ要ス加之能ク其任ニ堪ユベキ裁判官ヲ要ス、日本ノ進歩ハ著ク速ナル故此點迄ニ到達スルモ亦近キアラント余レハ自信ス

マルシヤル

佛國ガ日本ニ對スル裁判權ヲ自ラ拋棄スルノ時機來ラバ、日本ノ爲メ甚ク不都合不正ナル歐諸國連合一致シテ日本ニ對スル方法ヲ佛國ハ依然保持スベキヤ

ルイ

此裁判權ノ問題ハ他ト連合スベキ性質ヲ有セサル故余ガ考ニテハ佛國ハ他ニ拘ラスシテ獨リ斷行ス可シ、併シ此等ノ事ヲ今日ニ於テ談スルハ尙早シ、此事ヲ論スベキ點迄達スルニハ尙數年ヲ要スベシ、夫レ迄ノ間相互ノ希望ヲ並行セシムルヲ力ムベシ余ハ日本政府ガ其内地ノ佛民

我會議ノ感覺如何ニ注意爲致居候處過日佛國外務省商務局長ヘ同人面會ノ節東京會議ハ無結果ナリシ是ヨリ如何可被成ヤト被問懸候由旁推考候得ハ「トリクイー」ヨリモ會議ノ結果ヲ得サリシ事ヲ佛政府ヘ報告シタルナルベシ

一 在佛英公使館ヘモ東京會議錄凡テ到達ノ由ニテ「ブランクツト」氏ハ左ノ趣ヲ「マルシヤル」ヘ談話セシ由

東京會議ハ無効ナリシ、税目ノ一事ニ就テモ未タ明瞭セサレトモ此一事連モ或ハ其好結局ヲ見ル能ハサルベシ

右ノ通聞込候丈ケ則私信ヲ以テ申上置候唯々入念ノ爲申上候儀故公使館往復書類ヘモ載セ不申寫ヲモ止メ置不申全ク閣下御參考迄ノ事ト御承知被成下度候尤他人ノ機密ニ屬シ且ツ彼等ノ身上ニモ相及ヒ公事漂露スルノ儀故其邊篤ク御含ノ上全ク御一覽ノ上御投火被成下度候アダムス氏ノ如斯秘事ヲ我々耳染ニ觸レシメタル其眞意ハ如何ノ點ニ有之哉小生直々面談不致儀故十分見貫キ候事不相叶残念奉存候萬一此アダムスノ言語ニ就キ有益ナル事モ候ハ、猶此機ニ會シ彼ヘ申含候條々御示シ被成下度奉願候

(以下省略)

## 附屬書

註 本信ニハ年月日モ發信者及受信者名モ記入サレ居ラズ

(十五年七月 日「アダムス」氏談話要略)

現今在ベルヌ府英公使アダムス氏來巴ノ節顧問格「マルシヤル」ト密話セシ條々ノ要略ヲ左ニ記述ス

條約改正豫議會ニ付キ其感覺如何ヲ在東京ノ或外國交際官(註 英書記官サトー氏ナルヘシ)ヨリ内々書キ送りタル書狀中ノ趣ハ即チ左ノ如シ

東京會議ハ無結果ナリシ依テ猶數年ハ改正覺東ナシト被考バアクス氏ヘ與ヘタル英政府ノ訓令ヲ東京ニ於テ一見セシ者ハ日本政府ノ望ヲ全ク貫徹セシムルノ難キヲ豫メ承知シ居タリ如何ナレハ「バアクス」ハ増税ノ事ヲ承諾スルノ權ヲ有シ居リシノミニテ其他ハ悉ク拒絶スヘキトノ命令ヲ受ケ居リシ、然ラハ會議好結果ニ到ラサリシコトモ敢テ驚クニ足ラス(註 以上書翰ノ大意)

英外務省中ニハ「バアクス」ハ日本ヨリ轉勤スルトノ風説アリト或人余ニ告ケタリ其風俗確實ナルヤ否ハ素ヨリ保シ難ケレトモ多分ヴエド氏ノ代リニ清京ニ赴ク可シト

論旨ヨリモ他ノ論旨ヲ主張セサル可ラス、日本ハ能ク實際ノ景況ヲ比較セサリシ當ニ其權理ヲ主張スルノミニテ事ヲ爲遂ルト自信セシ如キモ權理ノ力ハ素ヨリ小ナリ道理ノ勢モ亦甚タ大ナラス最強ノ者ハ獨リ強者ノ權力ナリ日本ハ強者ノ權力ヲ有セサル故ニセメテ道理ノ勢力ヲ假ルヲ要ス併シ其道理ハ歐人ノ能ク了解スル道理ナラサル可ラス就テハ條約修了期限ノ事ヲ一ノ覺書ニ認メ歐人ヲ説服スヘキ理由ヲ詳記シテ余レニ示サレ度、余ハ終了期限ヲ何年何月日ト空ニ豫定セス日本カ改良スヘキ條件ト程度トヲ豫定シ置キ其度ニ達スル時ヲ以テ結了期限ト定メント欲ス

是ニテ日本ヘ赴任スルヲ許ルスヤ否ヲ問ウ見込ナリ

日本ニ關スル余カ見込ハ終了期限ノ一事ニ非ス地方行政ノ自由モ(リベルテ、アドミニストラチヴ)余カ目案中ニ在リ、地方行政ノ自由ヲ惣テ承諾セストモ多小ノ制限ヲ立テ少クトモ其自由ヲ日本ニ讓與セント欲ス余カ目案ハ現條約ノ終了期限ヲ定決スヘキ一事ニ止ラス尙終了期限ニ達スル迄ニ日本カ漸次ニ改良ヲ可加點ハ何レノ點ナルヤモ知ント欲ス、増税ノ一事ハ困難莫ルヘク想像

ノ風評ナリ彼ノ後任ハ多分拙者ナラント外務省中ノ或人等モ想像シ居ル由、余ハ果シテ可然トハ信セサレトモ或ハ其都合ニ到ルモ難計ト考居ルノミ此風聞ノ耳ニ入りシ以來余ハ潛心熟考セシ末尙君ニ(マルシヤル)告ケント欲スル數條アリ余ハ改正ヲ仕遂ル目的莫ク日本ヘ赴任スル意ハ毫モ無之壯年ニ非ス又獨立ニ生活スル丈ノ財産モアル故何カ一事ヲ爲ス目的ナク歐地ヲ離レルヲ欲セス余レ若シ改正ヲ仕遂レハ交際官事務中ニ一事ヲ仕成モシ微効モ相立チ余カ一身ノ爲メニモ満足ナルヘシ併シ此満足ヲ得ル事未タ期シ難シ其譯ハ是迄日本ノ外交政略巧ミナラサカ爲メニ友意アル者ニハ失望セシメ却テ敵意アル者ニハ力ヲ與ヘタリ又歐政府厚意ノ氣向モ舊時ノ如クナラス、一ノ調和ニ到ルニハ好時機ニ才智ヲ用ヒ相互ノ厚意ヲ用ル事須要ナリ、日本ノ事ニ付キ余ノ考ハ君カ常ニ知ル如ク拾年前ヨリ日本ノ事ヲ論議セシ主意ニ違ハサルナリ、余ハ條約ニ終了期限アルモノトスル論者ナリ、條約ニ終了期限莫ク永久ニ持續ス可キ者ト論スルハ眞ニ頑愚ト云ウヘシ、余ト説ヲ同ウセサル者モアルヘケレトモ歐各國ニ終了期限ヲ承諾セシムルニハ日本カ是迄主張セシ

ス、地方行政自由(Liberté administrative)ノ問題ハ少ク難問ナレハ之ヲ成遂ルニハ多少ノ障礙ナキニ非ス此制限アル地方行政自由ノ件々ニ付テモ亦一ノ覺書ヲ見ント欲ス余カ爲メニ之ヲ作り賜ヘ。「バアクス」ハ日本ノ反對者故ニ日本ヘ讓與スヘキ事ニ付キ事々抵抗スルヲ好メリ同人カ數年間日本ニ釀成セシ害物ヲ掃除スルハ容易ノ事ニ非ス彼ハ充分ニ其目的ヲ遂ケタル故今ニ到テ英外務省ノ目的ヲ豹變セシムルハ輕易ナラス然レトモ若シ我レニ日本ヘ可赴任ノ命令アラハ英外務省ノ目的ヲ多少變改シ得ル見込無キニ非ス

何レニセヨ余レ在東京公使ヲ承諾スルハ余カ見込ヲ外務省ニ示シテ聽容許可セラレシ後ナルヘシ聽容ナケレハ勿論東京迄往ク見込ナシ今日話ス事柄ハ素ヨリ余ノ大主意ニ過キサルナリ

余若シ英政府ニ條約終了期限ト地方行政自由(リベルテ、アドミニストラチヴ)ノ兩大主意ヲ日本ヘ讓與ス可ク承諾セシムルニ到ラハ東京ヘ赴任ノ前ニ巴里ト伯林ニ赴キ英ト同意ニテ日本ノ條約改正ヲ同意スルヤヲ聞キ質シ同意ヲ得レハ東京ニ到ルヘシ治外法權ノ一事ハ條

約終了期限ノ來ル迄依然ト存シ置キ今度ノ改正ニ付キ議スルノ意ナシ余カ目案ノ大要右ノ如シ

余ノ目案ヲ實施スルニハ君ノ助言ヲ必要ナリト信ス余ノ目案ハ極秘密ニシテ相互決テ他言ス可ラス

此ノ目案ヲ行ハシムルニハ歐洲ニ說解スル事ヲ勉メサル可ラス是迄日本ハ毫モ說解辨駁ニ力ヲ用ヒサリシ余カ歐洲ト云ウハ歐洲各國政府ノ事ニシテ敵意ヲ懷テ東京ニ在留スル公使ヲ云ウニ非ス彼等ノ敵意ヲ知りナカラ同手段ヲ以テ改正ノ事ヲ討議スルハ無用タルヘシ

他日再會ノ時ニハ必ス二件ノ覺書ヲ見シ事ヲ欲ス其時ニ當リ其覺書ヲ相互ニ眞實ニ討議センコトヲ希望ス

二九一 明治十五年二月十四日

井田駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

### コント氏談話ノ大要内報ノ件

附屬書 十五年十一月十六日コント氏談話大要

過般マドリット府ヨリ秘密私信ヲ以テ豫會議ノ始末御内報申上候末猶又小生不在申別紙ノ如キ條々内聞及候旨書記生大山ヨリ申出候間不取敢再秘密私信ニテ内報及候仍而先便

爲ニ好結果ニ到ラサリシト顧問格「マルシヤル」ハ曾テ語リシ趣等ハ豫テ傳聞致居リタル處不月十六日佛人トニ、コント氏公使館ヘ參ラレ四方山ノ話ノ末「マルシヤル」ト改正ノ事ヲモ鄙官ノ目前ニテ談話致サレ候ニ付其大略ヲ記シ閣下ノ參考ニ供ス

マルシヤル 東京會議ニ付君ノ感覺ハ如何

コント 會議ハ毫モ結局ヲ生セサリシ、是ヨリ後チ數年ノ間條約改正ヲ埋葬シタリ、萬事再ヒ初メサル可ラス、余ハ「パアクス」氏ニ甚タ不満足ノ事アリ日本出發前同氏ニ面會余ノ見込ヲ述ヘ置キシ處出發後ニ彼レ我カ主意ヲ取テ自家ノ說ト爲シ論述セラレシ一事ナリ  
日本人ハ最初ニ簡易ノ事柄ヨリ商議スルヲ爲サス却テ混雜ノ事柄ヨリ商議ヲ初メタリ

會議中シイボルト氏ハ余輩ニ多ク質問ヲ掛ケラレタレトモ余輩ハ質問ノ意味ヲ善ク解スル能ハサリシ

マルシヤル 君ハ「トリク」氏ヲ如何ニ思ハルルヤ  
コント (暫ラク狐疑シテ) 余ハ「トリク」氏ニ付何事モ言ハス彼ハ日本ニ對シ嚴酷ナリシ、日本政府ノ發議ヲ承諾スヘク同人ヨリ佛政府ニ勸メサル事慥ナリト余ハ愚

申上候條々ト果シテ相照應シ大ニ痛心ノ至奉存候如此景況ニ全ク立到候ハ、誠ニ永クノ御苦配モ其効顯ノ在處ヲ不見如何ニモ殘念ノ至何卒可然好結果ヲ得度存奉候得共或ハ自今派出公使ヨリ豫會議ノ回答ヲ提シ併テ我政府要求スル處ノ理由ヲ爲申出候様ニテハ如何哉彼是御熟考ノ上先便申上候意味等ニ對シ御内答被成下候様奉願候右ハ今朝歸巴ノ懸縷々不能申陳大略拜啓如此御座候謹言

十一月二十四日

井田讓

井上外務卿殿

私信秘密

先便私信同様是亦公使館簿書中不書載致候間全クノ私信ト御承知被成下度候且アダマス氏ノ内話等ハ大ニ有所見筋トモ愚考罷在候間右邊ハ十分御内考有御座度此段追啓申上候  
頓首

附屬書

(十五年十一月十六日コント氏談話ノ大略)

在東京外國交際官某ヨリ其一友人ハ我東京會議ハ無効ナリシト書送リタル事ト在巴英大使館ノ一等書記官ブランケツト氏并ニ佛外務省商務局長クラヴリ氏ヨリモ豫議會ハ我カ

考ス

マルシヤル 他ノ事柄ハ今ナリニ差置キ海關稅ノミヲ増加スル事ハ各國政府ニ於テ承諾スヘキヤ否君ニハ如何思ハルルヤ

コント 否決シテ承諾ス可ラス曾テ上野氏カ余ニ向テ「稅則ノ事ニ付テハ彼我同意ヲ得ルニ至リシ故條約ノ他ノ點ハ差置キ稅則ノ改正丈ケヲ好マルルヤ」ト問ハレシ事アリ其時モ余ハ否ト答ヘタリ、如何トナレハ歐洲ニハ一ノ利益モ與ヘス獨リ日本一國ノ爲メニ稅則ヲ増ス事ハ決テ出來サレハナリ、君等モ知ル如ク交際ハ精神上ノ事ニ非ス一己ノ私事ニ非ス商事其他ノ仕事ト同シク交際モ一ノ仕事ナリ

マルシヤル 或人ヨリ余カ一友人ニ送リタル書中ニ「パアクス」氏在京ノ間ハ改正スル事能ハストノ趣ヲ書セリ君モ同說ナルヤ

コント 否余ハ同說ニ非ス、否、若シ日本政府カ歐政府ヘ善ク相談ヲ爲サハ余ハ「パアクス」ノ在勤中ト雖モ改正スルヲ得ヘシト信ス、乍併日本ハ米人ノミニ相談セリ「ビンガム」其他爲ス可カラサル事ヲ主張スル米國人ハ

日本カ何カ事ヲ決スルニ方デハ、イツモ終末ノ顧問役ナリ、余ハ「マルシヤル」氏ヘ尙内々話サント欲スル事多シ

マルシヤル 悦デ承ルヘシ、會議ノ結局ニ付英人ノ感覺ハ既ニ屢聞キタレトモ會議ニ列セシ佛人ヨリ其感覺ヲ聞ク事今日初メナリ、大山ヘモ余ト同時ニ君ノ細話ヲ聞カセタシ

コント 好シ、明日午後大山氏ト共ニ來ラレ、余カ外務省ヘ送リシ公信ノ寫ヲモ内々讀聞カスヘシ

マルシヤル 日本居住ハ君ノ意ニ適セシヤ

コント 余ハ日本ヘ二年居リシ二年ハ常ニ二年也併シ岩倉氏初メ其他ヨリモ懇遇ヲ受タリ、今日外務卿ヂユクレール氏ト面會ノ筈ナレハ最早時間無シ又明日談話スヘシ  
翌十七日「マルシヤル」ト同伴ノ積ナリシ處マルシヤルハ當日病氣外出ヲ得サリシ故鄙官ノミ「コント」氏ヲ尋問シ左ノ趣ヲ談話セリ

大山 「マルシヤル」ハ今日病氣ニ付共ニ來ルヲ得サリシ事遺憾ナレトモ昨日御話ノ事ヲ尙委ク聞クヲ得ハ幸甚ナリ

トセバ各國政府ヨリ別ニ返答モ爲サ、ル事ト考ヘラル、ヤ

コント 日本政府ノ發議ハ廻文ニ認メナキ故歐政府ヨリ自ラ返答ハ爲サ、ルベシ日本公使ヨリ歐外務卿ヘ意見ヲ聞カバ日本ノ發議ニ同意或ハ不同意ヲ答ルニ過キサルベシ  
大山 他事ヲ差措キ税則而已ヲ増加スル事モ甚タ六カシク思ハル、ヤ

コント 勿論ナリ會議中ニ此ケ條ニ付テハ不同意ヲ述ヘ置タリ、鄭重禮儀ノ言詞ハ用ヒタレトモ會議錄第拾三號中ニアル余ノ言詞ハ全ク不同意ヲ含メリ税則増加、倉庫税等凡テ増税ハ日本ノ爲ナリ増税ノ到益ヲ取ル代リニ歐洲ニハ如何ナル益ヲ與ヘラル、ヤ、又開國モ日本ノ爲メナリ歐米人ノ爲メニ非ス、日本在留中余レ親シク善ク日本ノ景況ヲ觀タリ日本ニハ商工等大事業ヲ起スベキ資金無シ外人ヘ内地ニ於テ自由營業セシムルモ日本ノ爲ナリ日本ニハ未タ堪能ノ裁判官ナキ故日本法律ニ歐人ヲ從ハシメ難シ、日本ハ内地ヲ開カサルトハ言ヒ居レトモ歐人ニテ内地ヘ往カント欲スル者ハ其筋ノ許可ヲ受ケ商人等ハ番頭ヲ列レ往テ商事ヲ爲ス故開國セシト殆ント同一ノ姿

コント 昨日ハ外務卿ト面晤スルヲ得サリシ、東京ヨリ外務卿ヘ送リシ余ノ公信控ヲ御覽ニハ入レ難ケレトモ内々君ニ讀聞カス可シ此公信中ニ述タル如ク會議ノ好結果ニ到ラサル事ハ余モ豫見シ居タリ

ト述テ公信ノ控ヲ讀聞セタリ其初メニハ我ヨリ發議ノ條々ヲ簡短ニ撮録シ彼我互ニ叮嚀懇親ノ色ヲ表スル會議ノ景況ヲ述ヘ終リニハ米獨其他ノ公使等日本ヘ對シ懇親厚意ノ色アレトモ「バアクス」氏ハ嚴シキ反對論ヲ近々起サントスル模様ナリ此頃同氏ト面會ノ際自家ノ見込ヲ語リシニ贊成セラレタリ同氏嚴シク抵抗セハ其他ノ好氣持モ行ハレス會議ハ結局ヲ生セサルヘク想像ス英公使ガ嚴ク反對論ヲ起ス可シトノ一事ハ今日ヨリ閣下ヘ確言シ得ル事ト信スル等ノ事ニ有之シ様聞取リ候

大山 君ハ昨日モ會議ハ無効ナリシト話サレタリ實ニ全ク無効ナリシト思ハルルヤ

コント 然リ全ク終リシ是ヨリ何モ可爲事ナシ

大山 余ハ日本發議ニ同意或ハ不同意ヲ各國政府ヨリ答フベキ事ト思フ然ルニ君ノ云ヘル如ク會議全ク無効ナリシ

ナリ改正ハ日本ノ爲ナル故外國ハ是非トモ改正セント欲スベキモ利益モ目的モ無キ事君ノ知ル如シ

大山 余ハ君ノ談話ヲ聞キニ來リシ故君ニ對シテ論議スベキ譯ナシ會議好結果ヲ得サリシト聞クハ甚タ遺憾ナリ、然レトモ條約ハ到底改正セサル可ラス、君ノ言フ如ク今度ノ會議ヲ無結果ト假定シテ更ニ次回會議スルニハ歐地ニ於テスルヲ好シト思ハル、ヤ

コント 「マルシヤル」ニモ此事ヲ委ク談話セント欲ス歐地ニ於テモセヨ、日本ニ於テモセヨ、相談スベキ適當ノ者ニ相談セズ彼ノ米人等ヲ顧問ニセラル、以上ハ共同承諾ニ到ル事甚ダ難カルベシ「ボワソナード」ハ博識ノ好キ人物ナレトモ同人ヘハ一言ノ相談モ無リシ趣ナリ

大山 然ラバ在東京外國交際官中モ互ニ不和ナルヤ  
コント 否別ニ不和アルニ非ズ

大山 種々有體ニ話シ賜ハリシ厚意ヲ謝ス亦近日面會スベシ  
コント 余ハ日本在留中モ日本人ニ向テ有體ニ見込ヲ述居タリ、若シヤ今日談話ノ事ヲ君ガ郵送スルモ敢テ怪ム者非ルベシ

明治十五年十一月二十四日

書記生 大山 綱介

井田公使閣下

二九二

明治十六年五月十八日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ノ對英回答ニ關スル件

機密 第三十三號 書拔<sup>1</sup>

條約改正一件ニ關スル英政府ノ廻狀ニ對シ佛政府ノ意向ヲ  
内密探偵候處修好局議ハ通商新條約ヲ無期ニテ締結スル英  
政府ノ發案ニ反シ決シテ認諾ス可ラサルモノト做シ其意ヲ  
以テ英政府ニ回答ス可キ趣尤通商局ノ議ハ未タ分明ナラサ  
レトモ多分同意スルナル可クトノ事ニ有之右「マルシャル」  
氏探偵ノ大要ニ有之候

明治十六年五月十八日

駐佛全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

外務卿井上馨殿

註 1 關外註ニ「本書見ヘズ」トアリ

2 次號文書附屬書中「ボリテカル・デパートメント」

右中進候也

明治十六年六月十五日

駐佛全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

外務卿井上馨殿

註 1「本月八日」ハ本月六日ノ誤ナランカ「談話筆記」ニ

ハ六月六日トアリ

2 附屬書ニ來電ナルニ付參照

附屬書一

(十六年六月六日蜂須賀公使佛外務卿談話筆記譯文)

千八百八十二年六月六日蜂須賀公使ト「シヤルメル、

ラクール」氏ト談話筆記譯

シヤルメル、ラクール氏 朝鮮或ハ清國ノ事並ニ此兩國間

ノ意向ニ關シ日本ヨリ何ニカ新報ヲ得ラレタルヤ

公使 格別緊要ノ新報ヲ得ス然シ東京事件其他佛國ト安南

ノコトニ關シ拙者ヨリ報告ヲ爲シタレハ我政府ヨリ訓令

ヲ送越スヘシト待居レリ東京問題ニ付テハ我レノ大ニ注

目スル所ナリ

シヤルメルラクール氏 閣下ハアジャンスハウワスト目今

比德保府ニ在ル清國公使氏トノ談話ヲ御閱讀ナリタル可

シ思フニ右ハ事實ナルヘシ且ツ曾氏ノ言ノ如ク清政府ハ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二九三

トアルニ願ミ修好局トハ今日政務局ノコトナリ

二九三

明治十六年五月十五日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛外務卿ノ内話ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十六年六月六日蜂須賀公使佛外務卿談話筆記

二 十六年六月十二日發蜂須賀公使來電

機 第三十六號

八月二日到

本月八日當國勳章御受領謝禮ノ御親書大統領ヘ捧呈ノ儀依  
賴ノ爲メ當外務卿ヘ面會イタシ候段公信ヲ以テ申進置候處  
其節外務卿ハ東京一件ニ付清國ニ對シ日佛ハ同一ノ利益ヲ  
有スル等ノ儀ニ話及シ暗ニ我政府ノ意向ヲ致承知度様相見  
ヘ且ツ條約改正一件ニ關シ可成兩國ノ利益タル可キ結局ヲ  
得度云々談話有之候其大要大山書記生佛文筆記ノマ、差出  
候右二件ニ關シテハ當政府ヘ回答ノ都合モ有之小官龍動府  
ヘ罷越森公使共相談ノ末條約改正一件ニ付既ニ同公使及青  
木公使ヨリ各自其任國政府ヘ差送候書簡之趣意ヲ以テ小官  
ヨリモ當政府ヘ申入可然與相考則別紙電<sup>2</sup>報差出閣下ノ御訓  
令相待居候也

開戰ノ意ハ勿ルヘシ拙者ハ清政府カ我ヲシテ公然干戈ヲ

動サシムルニ至ラサランコトヲ希望ス然シナカラ御承知

ノ如ク清政府ノ要望ハ法外ニシテ且其實ニ過ク思フニ清

國ニ向テハ佛國ト日本トノ其利害ヲ同フセリ

公使 アジャンスハウワストノ筆記ハ實ニ閱讀セリ清國要望

ノ法外ナル事ハ閣下ト御同說ナリ此件ニ關シテハ又我政

府ヘ報告ヲ爲ス積ナリ

シヤルメルラクール氏 佛日兩國間ニ何ニカ差掛リタル問

題ハ勿リシカ何ニカ通商條約改正ニ關係シタル事ハ無キ

ヤ

公使 然リ差掛リタル問題ハ當ニ目今兩國間ニ差迫リタル

通商條約ノ件ノミニアラス又兩國間諸條約ノ改正是ナリ

閣下御承知ノ如ク我政府ハ曩ニ東京豫議會ニ於テ改正案

ヲ提出シ各國ノ承認ヲ得ン事ヲ切望シタリ貴政府ニ於テ

ハ我提出案ヲ勘考シ速カニ其局ヲ結ハン事は拙者ノ希望

スル所ナリ

シヤルメルラクール氏 提出案ノ廉々ト紛議ノ點ヲ今示メ

サル、事ヲ得ヘキヤ拙者ハ嘗テ之ヲ承知シ居タルカ今少

シク之ヲ忘却シタリ拙者ハ間ヲ得次第之ヲ勘考スヘシ

九一九

公使 此等ノ問題ニ付テハ後日閣下ト談判ニ及フ可シ我政府ハ各國ニ示シタル提出案ノ回答ヲ待居レルカ故ニ閣下ハ友誼ト懇切ノ心ヲ以テ御勘考アラシム事ヲ希望ス  
シヤルメルラクル氏 諾、聞ヲ得次第之ヲ勘考シ日本ニモ都合能ク又佛國ニモ都合能キ様謀ルヘシ斯ノ如ク謀テ兩國間ノ交誼ヲシテ益々鞏固ナラシムルニ至ラハ拙者ハ幸甚シキナリ

公使 閣下ノ懇切ナル言辭信實ナル趣意ハ我政府ニ取リテモ又拙者ニ取リテモ深ク感佩セサルヲ得サルナリ拙者閣下ニ謝ス

畢

註 「トシヤンス・トシヤン」ノコトナリ

(中絶ス)

Conversation du Ministre Hachisuka

avec M. Challemeil-Lacourt le 6 juin 1883.

Mr. Challemeil-Lacourt: Avez-vous reçu quelques nouvelles du Japon concernant la Corée ou la Chine, et les sentiments qui animent ces pays, ce grand pays?

Mr. Hachisuka: Je n'ai pas reçu des nouvelles spécialement intéressantes. Mais comme j'ai fait des rapports au sujet de Tonkin, sur ce qui se passe entre la France et l'Annam, j'espère que mon Gouvernement m'enverra les instructions. Nous regardons les questions de Tonkin avec un grand intérêt.

Mr. Challemeil-Lacourt: J'imagine que vous avez lu la conversation de l'Agence Havas avec le Marquis de Tseng, Ministre de Chine qui est maintenant à St Petersburg. Je crois qu'il y a de la vérité, et que le Gouvernement Chinois n'a pas, comme l'a dit M. de Tseng, l'intention belliqueuse. J'espère qu'il ne nous obligera pas de prendre ouvertement des mesures rigoureuses. Mais le Gouvernement Chinois a les prétentions excessives et exagérées que vous savez je pense que l'intérêt de la France et du Japon vis-a-vis de la Chine est commun.

Mr. Hachisuka: J'ai lu, en effet, la note de l'Agence Havas, et je pense avec Votre Excellence que les prétentions de la Chine sont exagérées. J'ai l'inten-

tion de faire aussi des rapports à ce sujet.

Mr. Challemeil-Lacourt: n'y-t-il pas quelques questions pendantes entre la France et le Japon, quelque chose du renouvellement des traités de commerce?

Mr. Hachisuka: Oui, les questions pendantes sont, non seulement les questions des traités de commerce, qui sont urgentes pour nous, mais les révisions de tous nos traités. Comme Votre Excellence le sait, mon Gouvernement a fait à la conférence de Tokio les propositions pour la révision, et il les a faites avec un vif désir d'obtenir le consentement des Puissances. J'espère que le Gouvernement Français aura la bonté d'étudier nos propositions avec l'équité et la bienveillance pour arriver au prompt résultat.

M. Challemeil-Lacourt: Pourriez-vous m'indiquer les points de vos propositions et les difficultés? Je les savais autrefois, mais je les ai un peu oubliés. Aussitôt qu'il me sera possible, je les étudierai.

Mr. Hachisuka: J'aurai l'honneur d'entretenir Votre Excellence de ces questions un autre jour, plus tard. Mon Gouvernement attends la réponse des propositions qu'il a soumises aux Puissances. J'es-

père que Votre Excellence voudra bien les étudier avec l'amitié et la bonne volonté.

Mr. Challemeil-Lacourt: Oui, je les étudierai, aussitôt qu'il me sera possible, avec l'intention d'être favorable pour le Japon et favorable pour la France. En agissant ainsi, si je pourrai rendre plus solide l'amitié des deux pays, j'en serai très heureux.

Mr. Hachisuka: Je suis très touché pour Mon Gouvernement et pour moi des bienveillantes expressions et cordiales intentions de Votre Excellence, je vous en remercie.

註轉轉

十六年六月十一日 巴黎新聞紙外電來記

(海峽殖民地新聞紙外電來記)

Gainkio, French Minister for Foreign Affairs has expressed to me his opinion that France and Japan have now a great common interest as regards Chinese pretensions and evidently wishes to know our dispositions as to Tonkin. Also asked what points as to treaty revision we principally desire to settle speedily. Will you authorize me to reply as follows: first,

Japan being sincerely the friend of France and a good neighbour to China and very desirous of peace, will use all her influence towards amicable satisfactory arrangement. Secondly, even if other questions must be left to subsequent settlement we ask that results of Tokio conference on commercial points including tariff should be carried into effect at once with the addition of termination clause.

Hachisuka

12 juin, 1883.

## 二九四

明治十六年六月二十二日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ノ對英回答ニ關スル「アルシヤル」氏報告  
送附ノ件

附屬書 十六年六月二十一日附アルシヤル氏報告書

機 第三十七號 披露

條約改正一件ニ付當外務省ヨリ英政府ノ廻文ニ對スル回答  
ハ伊藤參議森公使等ノ打合置候通ニ相運候右ニ關スルアル  
シヤル氏報告書及御送附候

明治十六年六月二十二日

impossible, for Japan would never accept an unlimited treaty.

Consequently, it seemed clear that it was the duty of the agents of Japan in Europe to struggle against the suggestions contained in the English Circular, and, without waiting for instructions, Marshall instantly began to employ private influence in the hope of leading France to reject the English scheme and to put before Europe a more liberal and more just solution.

Marshall begged the French Foreign Office to make a counterproposal, and to claim that, in the place of the English plan of unlimited duration, the revised treaties should, on the contrary, be declared to be *terminable in every point*.

Mr. Hachisuka reached Paris on 14 May and was immediately informed of the action which had been confidentially commenced at the Foreign Office. He fully approved it, but, as he had no instructions other than to generally carry into effect, if possible, the claims put forward by Japan at the Tokio Conference, it was that the negotiation could not

外務卿井上馨殿

全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

附屬書

十六年六月廿一日附アルシヤル報告書

Paris, 21 June 1883

Report of Private negotiations with  
the French Foreign Office on Revision

On the 4 May Mr. Mori informed the Japanese Legation in Paris that the English Government had just sent out a Circular to the Treaty Powers on the subject of revision and he asked that, if possible, the nature of that Circular should be discovered in Paris.

On 6 May the substance of that Circular was privately communicated to Marshall, and, on 11 May, Marshall wrote a report of it to Mr. Inoué.

As that Circular proposed to the Powers to simply increase the tariff and, simultaneously, to render the revised treaties *unimined in duration*, it was evident that such a proposal made revision

assume, in any way, an official form. So it went forward as an entirely non-official and confidential discussion. He was, however, carried on the utmost energy, with a wide extension of action and influences and with the aid of a variety of persons.

On 25 May Mr. Mori came to Paris, after meeting Mr. Ito at Berlin. He examined the details of the negotiation and recommended Mr. Hachisuka to introduce certain modifications into the plan which, so far, had been indicated, by Marshall, to the French Foreign Office.

In consequence, the following programme was drawn up and was communicated the same day to Mr. Ito, at Moscow.

The immediate solution, independent of all other questions, should be that the results of the Tokio Conference on commercial points (including tariff) be carried into effect with the addition of terminability thereon.

Furthermore, it is much to be desired that two additional suggestions should be put forward.

1. That the principle of terminability be recog-

nised as applying to all the other elements of the treaties.

2. That the question of administrative control over foreigners be examined, in order to decide what modifications can be at once introduced in that direction.

This programme was privately communicated by Marshall to the French Foreign Office.

The influences set to work then were so various and so powerful, and the arguments set forth were so convincing that the Political Department very soon accepted the programme. But the Commercial Department (which has the practical management of the revision) was less willing to agree; one of the sub-directors, indeed, declared that he was absolutely opposed to it. He argued that, in principle, France could not take the lead in such a question, and that, in practice, terminability was an unrealisable impossibility.

But, though this sub-director and some other functionaries who shared his views, were able to cause obstruction and delay, they were not strong

enough to prevent the final adoption of the programme.

On 20 June, after a long struggle and much anxiety, Marshall had the satisfaction of being informed by the Political and Commercial Directors, one after the other, that France adopts the programme privately communicated by Marshall, that the reply of France to the English Circular will be at once prepared on the basis of that programme, and that France will use her best influence with the Treaty Powers to induce them to accept that programme.

Furthermore, the Commercial Director promised to send Marshall a copy of the French answer to the English Circular as soon as it is signed by the Minister, and to at once instruct the French Minister at Brussels to acquaint the Belgian Government with the decision of France, so as to facilitate the similar negotiation which will be commenced at Brussels next week.

France will ask Japan to suppress the export duties on silk.

The principle of the action of France being thus settled it only remains to be seen what words she will employ in order to carry it into effect.

二九五 明治十六年六月二十二日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

有期通商條約締結方佛政府ニ於テ承諾ノ件

附屬書 十六年六月二十一日發蜂須賀公使來電

別紙寫の通昨夜發電したし置候委細の儀は今便差出候報告書(マルシヤル筆記英文の分)にて御承知被下度候  
右申進候也

明治十六年六月二十二日

駐佛特命全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

外務卿井上馨殿

附屬書

十六年六月二十一日發蜂須賀公使來電

Envoyé le 21 juin 1883 par la

Russie.

I am quite satisfied to inform you that I find in return to Paris from Vienna that after several

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 二九五 二九六

weeks of confidential negotiation France ultimately has agreed to propose, in opposition to English proposal, immediate treaty revision of commercial parts of our treaty with the examination of administrative questions in order to introduce some immediate modifications therein and with a declaration that the entire treaty without distinction of parts is to be regarded as terminable. I now proceed to Brussels to endeavour to obtain some result there. The action of France with respect to treaty revision being decided such, I no longer need instructions for which I asked in my last telegram from Vienna.

Hachisuka

二九六

明治十六年七月十四日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
蜂須賀駐佛公使宛

期限附條約締結方ニ關スル佛國政府ノ内約ニ關スル件

附屬書一

十六年六月二十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

二

十六年六月三十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

三

十六年七月十四日發蜂須賀公使來電

九二五



## 機密 第十九號

## 蜂須賀公使機密信案

東京事件ニ付五月二十七日六月九日同十四日十八日露都發電信別紙自一號至五號<sup>1</sup>寫ノ通知接閱候就中第四號<sup>2</sup>ノ電報ニ據ルニ佛國外務卿ノ意見ニテハ支那政府ノ主張スル屬邦主義ニ關シ目下日佛兩國間其利害ヲ同スルニ付我政府ノ東京事件ニ關スル意向致承知度趣且同時ニ條約改正ノ論題ニ付我政府ノ特ニ希望スル要點致承知度申出候趣右ハ佛國政府一面ニ於テハ我希望ニ協同シ他ノ一面ハ東京事件ニ關シ日佛兩國連合シ清政府ノ屬邦說ヲ排斥セント欲スルノ政略ニ外ナラズト推察致候然ルニ目下日清ノ關係ハ貴官ニモ御承知ノ通嚮キニ琉球事件アリ後ニ朝鮮ノ騷擾アリ爾來清政府ノ我ヲ嫌惡怨望スル日一日ヨリ甚シク爲メニ東洋ノ平和ヲ保全スルニ苦慮致候折柄今又我ニ平素關係ナキ(假令屬邦主義ニ至テハ同一理ニセヨ)遼遠ノ東京事件ニ付泰西ノ一國ト公然連合ノ舉動有之候テハ清國ノ憤焰ヲシテ一層旺盛ナラシメ火ヲ積薪ニ移スノ虞ナキ能ハス彼ヲ思ヒ此ヲ慮ルトキハ此際輕易ニ佛國ノ政略ニ同意シ東京事件ニ就キ陽ニ清國ニ抗抵ノ形迹ヲ露ワシ難ク因テ同月二十日別紙

且貴官ニモ森公使ト御會合相成諸事御打合相成候趣拙官ニ於テモ斯諸使臣協同御盡力相成候儀ハ從來希望致候儀ニ付今後共各自其意見ヲ融通シ同一ノ手段ヲ以テ各任國政府ニ勸說シ我目的ヲ達候様致度候別紙青木並ニ森<sup>4</sup>ノ私信御心得ノ爲メニ中差進候間右之旨趣ヲ以テ御盡力相成度候此段申進候也

## (追進省略)

十六年七月十四日起草同日發信

- 註 1 五月二十七日一號、六月九日二號、同十日三號及十八日五號露都發電信ニ相當スルモノ見當ラス  
2 六月十四日露都發四號電報ハ十二日巴里發二九三附屬書ニ電報ナリ  
3 七號電報六月二十一日露都發ハ同二十一日巴里發二九五附屬書電報ナリ  
4 青木及森公使宛私信寫ハ見當ラザルモ二二三九文書森公使宛往信參照

## 附屬書一

六號 十六年六月二十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

Japanese Minister

Petersburg.

To Hachisuka. Your telegram of 14 instant duly

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二九六

六號寫ノ通り答電ニ及候儀ニ有之候間右ノ旨趣御體認ノ上可成日佛共同事ヲ舉候儀ニ付我政府ヲコンミットセサル様ニ御注意相成度候尤我政府公然連合ノ儀ハ右ノ次第ニ付希望不致候得共陰ニ清國ノ屬邦主義ヲ排斥シ佛國ノ論旨ヲ贊成シ速ニ平和ノ結局ニ至リ候様不便ヲ用ヒ候ハ勿論ノ儀ニ付此意程好ク佛政府へ御申入相成度候

一、條約改正事件ニ付佛政府ノ決意御電報<sup>3</sup>(七號)ノ趣實ニ満足ニ存候右ハ全ク貴官並ニマルシャル氏從來ノ盡力ニ出テ候儀ト存候不堪欣喜候但タ佛國政府意見ノ如ク一般ノ條約裁判稅則ヲ併セテ有期ノケ條ヲ加ヘ改正ヲ遂候ハ素ヨリ我政府ノ希望スル所ニ有之候得共各政府ニ於テハ或ハ之ヲ至難ト爲シ候哉ト致過慮候間先以通商條約ノミヘ期限ヲ付シ實施候様致度將又佛國政府ノ決意ハ既ニ御電報ノ如ク親シク外務卿ヨリ御聽取相成候儀ニ付固ヨリ信據スルニ足ルヘク候得共御承知ノ通り佛國內閣之更迭モ屢次ノ儀ニ付覺書又ハ在日本公使ヘノ訓令ニテモ付與相成候テ稍々公然ノ承認ヲ取り置候様致度候間即チ別紙八號ノ通發電ニ及候儀ニ有之候

將又改正事件ニ就テハ森公使ヨリモ英政府ノ意向報道有之

received. You may assure French Minister for Foreign Affairs that His Imperial Majesty's Government feels greatly concerned about the recent outrageous affairs at Tonkin and can not help deeply sympathising with the French Government and would gladly render such friendly good offices as lies in its power to stay possible breach of peace with China. As to the treaty revision we desire first of all to conclude its commercial part with the proposed Tariff annexed and with well defined termination clause as we had proposed at the preliminary conference. All other subjects connected with jurisdiction question may be left to subsequent negotiation.

Yoshida.

## 附屬書二

八號 十六年六月三十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

To Hachisuka. Just returned from Saikio and found your telegram of 23 instant highly satisfactory. If you feel certain that French Government is determined to act in opposition to the English Circular, you should try to obtain from the said

government that determination in some form of writing or in exchange of notes and at the same time, try to induce them to make the same communication to this Department through the French Chargé d'Affaires here. These steps are very necessary to complete the formality and especially to ensure the fulfillment of their determination. Use your best personal efforts to secure the success of this important matter.

Inouye.

註釋三

十六日申午十四日發着候外務省

Envoyé le 14 juillet 1883

par la Russie

Gaimukio

I sent you yesterday mail Copy of French answer to English Circular in realization of decision announced in my telegram of 21 June. That answer accepts immediate treaty revision of tariff, and proposes to insert a clause by which the date of termination thereof would be fixed at some future time and proposes also that a similar clause of

ハヤレサハ男爵ノテ通譯書  
三 同 十三日インミヤル氏ノ口耳義外務大輔  
ノテ通譯書  
四 同 同日インミヤル氏ノ口耳義公使ノテ通譯書

Brussels, 19 July 1883.

Dear Mr. Ito,

I enclose five documents, marked A to E.

- A. Translation of the French answer to the English Circular.
- B. Conversation with Baron Lambermont 6 July.
- C. Conversation with Baron Lambermont 13 July.
- D. Conversation with Count de Montebello, French Minister in Brussels, 13 July.
- E. Translation of letter from Mr. Clavery, Director of Commercial Affairs, in the French Foreign Office 13 July.

These documents will place before your Excellency the present condition of the revision negotiations, so far as it has been possible to obtain information thereon from French and Belgian sources.

It results from these documents that, provided the Japanese Government is willing to accept the

termination be adopted as regards all the articles of the treaty, especially those of jurisdiction. It claims suppression of export duties on silk. It does not mention administrative question though they were included in the arrangement made in June. I will inquire why they are omitted.

Germany have communicated to Belgium note on our treaty revision. The note of Belgium will be sent to London next week. Both notes are described to me as not being unfavorable.

It would be difficult for me to ask France to communicate her proposal to you through French Chargé d'Affaires in Japan, for the proposal is now entirely confidential.

Hachisuka

二六日 同 外務省 伊藤参議宛  
外務省通譯書ノ中 (一)

註釋一 十六年七月七日附佛外務卿ヨリ在英國代理  
公使宛訓令  
二 同 六日インミヤル氏ノ口耳義外務大輔ノ

proposals which may be finally laid before it by the Powers, an early revision of the tariff may be expected with some certainty, and a declaration of terminability, in some shape, may be hoped for, unless England refuses to admit it.

Your Excellency will see, from the very interesting communications made to me by Baron Lambermont, that the French proposal of terminability appears to have been followed (so far, that is, as we can judge from Baron Lambermont's guarded language on 13 July) by suggestions with a somewhat similar object from Berlin and from Brussels. If this be the truth the individual importance of the French proposal no longer stands by itself but is merged in a group of analogous propositions; the service it has rendered to Japan is, however, all the more real because it seems to have had, to some small extent at all events, the effect of setting an example which has been followed and of stimulating the action of both Germany and Belgian.

It may be that no one of the plans of terminability put forward (supposing that Germany and

Belgian really make suggestions of terminability) will be accepted by the other Powers as it stands and that some modified solution will be adopted in the end-provided always that England abandons her present claim of permanence and consents, instead, to the principle of terminability. It seems, also, that we shall have to wait for decisive news until England has examined and answered the Notes of the Powers. Meanwhile, as the whole negotiation is confidential, nothing can be said to Japan; no isolated communication could, under the circumstances, be made to her. But though, in consequence of this, the Japanese Government can do nothing, officially, the Legations can do everything, nonofficially; not only can they collect information but they can influence the decisions of Governments. What has been effected in Paris since Mr. Hachisuka arrived there, and here in Brussels since he got here, supplies an example of what the Legations can do and of their real use and functions, and I indulge the hope that this will be thoroughly comprehended in Tokio, that Mr.

But, ever supposing that the Legations are, henceforth, most carefully instructed in anticipation of coming events and that the greatest pains are taken to utilise the Legations and to support them in their efforts to influence the decisions of European Governments, even then the question of personal capacity and of personal means of action will continue to largely affect the ends attained, and the absence of unity of work will always be a source of weakness. *The transfer of the entire negotiation to Europe is the true solution for these difficulties.* No Government seems disposed to confide decisions to its representative at Tokio; the right of control is, thus far, reserved by every cabinet; and nothing could serve more practically the true interests of Japan than to send a plenipotentiary at once to Europe with full powers to decide and sign.

Furthermore, experience is proving, conclusively, that results can be reached in Europe which are unattainable in Japan. The political atmosphere is different, feelings towards Japan are of another

Hachisuka will be energetically supported there, and that complete instructions will be sent to him at once on all the points be raised in his correspondence (most of those points are alluded to in the enclosed documents). The instructions would, of course, be used only confidentially by him in the present situation of the affair; but he should be authorized to act on them officially if the position changed and if official action became desirable.

It is necessary to foresee the possibility of changes in the position, and, at this great distance, your representatives should be thoroughly informed and instructed beforehand so that they may know how to proceed if new contingencies presents themselves. It is difficult, when modifications occur, to send sufficient details to Japan by telegraph; long reports are needed (as at the present moment) to explain exactly what is happening in Europe, and that difficulty constitutes an additional motive for employing much foresight in indicating to the Legations the conduct to be followed in all imaginable hypotheses.

character, views, are higher and wider than those which prevail amongst the traders of Yokohama and which, unfortunately, react upon the foreign Ministers at Tokio.

I may add that private influences can be employed here and that they are often singularly useful, for these reasons, provided the means and arguments set to work are of a nature to influence Europeans, far greater effects can be produced here than in Japan.

I fear, however, that many and important as would be the advantages of negotiating in Europe alone, that plan will not be admitted in Japan. I therefore venture to address to your Excellency the earnest entreaty that you will be pleased to recommend the next best solution, which is to supply from Japan the most careful and detailed instructions to your representatives, to tell them exactly what Japan will accept, to urge each of them to push on the revision with the Governments to which he is accredited, to do his utmost to improve its conditions, and to consult frankly on

every point with his colleagues. Mr. Hachisuka, to his great credit, has seen the value of all this and has not waited to be told to do it; he has pressed forward everywhere and he keeps his colleagues rapidly informed of all he learns and does, so as to guide and assist them. But he needs support from home now; otherwise, how can he move with certainty? Thus far we have been acting on our personal responsibility and we have had the profound satisfaction of carrying the prospects of revision to a point which they have never reached before; but we can go no further without precise orders. Of course we can and shall continue to discuss intentions and to obtain information in Switzerland, Belgium, France and Spain, and we shall be constantly traveling with that object; but we are at so advanced a stage now that we need to know what is the minimum which the Japanese Government will finally admit, and how we are to deal with new proposals. The first condition of success is to be able to seize opportunities as they arise, but if we have to write to

7 July 1883.

Sir,

In the month of January 1882, a conference met, as you know, at Tokio with the object of considering the ameliorations to be introduced into the permanent conventions which regulate the international relations of Japan with the various States of Europe and the United States of America. It sat till the month of July following, but at that date the Mikado's Government put forward a claim to divide the negotiation and to conclude at once separate arrangements as regards commercial questions, and, furthermore, to attribute to each of the contracting parties the faculty of denouncing all or part of the treaties at the expiration of a fixed period. In consequence of these claims which went beyond the understanding previously established between the States interested, the Conference had to be adjourned in order that the foreign delegates might refer to their Governments.

Thus far the British Government is the only one which has expressed its views on the subject. In

Japan such time a new idea presents itself and have to wait months for each answer, we may wish opportunities which will not recur.

I will continue to write to Your Excellency, in conformity with your instructions, whenever I have anything of interest to say.

My wife and daughter join me in kindest regards, and I remain

Dear Mr. Ito

Your Excellency's very faithful servant.

Fredrick Marshall.

伊東已代治伯文獻ニモハベテ伊藤參議ハ十六年八月三日歸朝ニアリテサニインマン氏報告ニ同參議馬耳塞出發後本邦宛リ發給ヨラントハ、ギンナニ、イ、伊藤參議ニヨリテ報告ガ外務省ニ同送ヨリニマン日歸ニ同カトナリス

附圖一

十六年四月廿五日駐佛外務卿ニ在英佛國代理公使宛書翰

Translation

The Minister for Foreign Affairs (of France) to Count d'Aunay, Chargé d'Affaires of France in London.

a memorandum which was communicated to me by Lord Lyons on 16 April last, and of which I annex a copy, the Cabinet of London expressed the disposition to agree, under certain conditions, to an increase of import customs duties in Japan, and to accept the project of tariff presented at the Conference, and it admitted the claim of the Japanese Government as to the immediate conclusion of a distinct arrangement for the settlement of tariff questions. But, at the same time the British Government declared that, as regards the proposals presented to the Conference by the Mikado's Minister for Foreign Affairs, with the Object of substituting Courts composed of foreign judges for Consular Tribunals, it would not be in a position to express an opinion until the laws which the proposed jurisdiction would to apply are completed and translated. Finally, the Cabinet of London informed us that it was not disposed to consent to any modification of Article 23 of the Anglo-Japanese treaty relative to the favoured nation clause, and that it could not admit the request of the Japanese

Government to insert in the revised treaties a clause to the effect that these arrangements would cease to be applicable at a fixed future date. The British Government consented only to introduce into the Convention which it is desired to conclude, as regards the tariff, a stipulation which would fix ten years as the duration of the new tariff, under the condition that any ulterior revision at the expiration of that period should be effected by common accord; but it has no intention to give up the permanent character of the treaties which exist between Great Britain and Japan.

In communicating these opinions to me Lord Lyons informed me that his Government would be glad to learn the views of the Government of the Republic on these different points, before addressing definitive instructions to its representative at Tokio.

As I promised the English Ambassador when I acknowledged the receipt of the annexed Memorandum; I have examined, conjointly with the Minister of Commerce, the questions mentioned by the

we could willingly lend ourselves to the insertion of a clause by which that date might be fixed by common accord, at some future moment, which future moment, also, would not now be indicated.

In our opinion, a clause of the same nature would be equally acceptable as regards the other questions (especially those of jurisdiction) which form the object of our treaty of 1858.

I shall be much obliged to you to draw up a Note based on the preceding statement and to hand it to Lord Granville, referring to the English Memorandum and expressing a wish to be informed of the result of the examination of this communication by the British Government.

You will find herewith, for your private information, a confidential note on the question as a whole. &c.

Signed, Chalmel Lacour

別紙A號標記へ文書見當ラギンキヨ本書翰ニ相當ケン  
モノア同ヘン

附屬書二

日 十六年七月六日マンニヤン氏ニ白耳義外務大輔ランベニキ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 二九七

Cabinet of London. We have recognized that we could, on our part, consent to an augmentation of import duties in Japan and to the conclusion of separate arrangement for the settlement of tariff questions, on the basis prepared in the Tokio Conference, but under the condition that the export duties on silk shall be suppressed and that there shall be certain improvements in details.

As regards the fixed limitation of the duration of this suggested arrangement, it appears to us, as it does to the British Government, that it cannot be admitted, and that it would be desirable for the moment, to fix only the date at which a new revision might be made by common accord between the interested parties. We think, however, that, on this point, it would be possible to give to Japan an entirely moral satisfaction by letting her perceive the possibility of recovering, at a more or less distant date, her liberty of action in Customs questions. With fixing for the present, as the Japanese Government asked in the Conference of 1882, the date at which the arrangement might be denounced,

ハ既載ノ文書標記

Brussels, 6 July 1883

Conversation between Marshall  
and Baron Lambermont, Secre-  
tary General of the Ministry of  
Foreign Affairs.

Lambermont. You are aware that the French Minister has not yet received from Paris the text of the French answer to the English Circular. And as regards the communication from Germany which you had reason to suppose had been sent out, I learn from the German Minister that no such communication has been made. The matter is under consideration at Berlin, but no decision is adopted yet. The German Minister adds, however, that he is instructed to tell us that when a decision is adopted, the other Governments will be made acquainted with it. Consequently, as we now know that Germany is preparing to express her opinion, it is evident that we must wait for that opinion

and that we cannot come to any final decision until it is before us. And I dare say that other Powers will have something to say also, and I fear that delay will occur.

Marshall. Have you any impression as to the probable nature of the opinion of Germany?

Lambertmont. I have no distinct impression. And even if I had I shall prefer not to indicate it. Germany will speak for herself.

Marshall. Do you think, then, that we can do nothing at all when the French text reaches you, and that we must stand idle, for an indefinite time, until the German note, also, is in your hands?

Lambertmont. Well, not quite that. There are points on which you might begin to enquire at once, so as to save time hereafter. The English Circular raises questions which will have to be dealt with, and I will mention some of them to you. England claims that foreigners shall have entire liberty of trade in and with Japan and that the Japanese Government shall cease to maintain monopolies or to support corporations or guilds whose

object is to exclude foreigners from direct contact with producers and customers in Japan. England will also ask that greater facilities for travelling with passports in the interior shall be granted to traders. And she will object to the intention of Japan to insert in the revised treaties any limitation or interpretation of the favoured nations clause. Such interpretation was included, it is true, in several European treaties, but, of late years, it has been abandoned as impracticable, and I do not think that Europe will grant it to Japan. It will be useful to communicate with the Japanese Government on these matters, for it is probable that Belgium will support the views of England with respect to them and that other countries will do the same.

Marshall. I will report this to Mr. Hachisuka, and he will inform his Government. But let me say to you, so far as I am myself concerned, that I should employ all the influence I can exercise to prevent the Japanese Government from granting facilities to traders for travelling in the interior.

Grave difficulties about jurisdiction would inevitably ensue if such a scheme were applied. The true solution for travelling in the interior is not to be found in that direction, but in the consent of European Governments to allow such of their subjects as may desire to go into the interior to accept Japanese jurisdiction as the condition of their doing so. Foreign jurisdiction cannot be extended beyond the present limits of the treaty ports, but the adoption of passports for the interior would be at once utilised by the foreign representatives at Tokio as a motive for claiming jurisdiction over the foreigners with passports. I will take an opportunity of thoroughly discussing that question with you. I have a great deal to say about it and many arguments to submit to you, and I do not doubt that I shall convince you that European Governments have no right to prevent their subjects from accepting Japanese jurisdiction, if, for their own benefit and of their own free will, they ask to do it.

As regards the interpretation of the favoured

nation clause I explain that the object sought by defining that interpretation is precisely to prevent difficulties on these very questions of travelling in the interior and personal rights in general. If Europe has abandoned the employment of that interpretation in recent treaties and now applies the clause without any restrictions it is because the clause applies, exclusively, in those treaties, to commercial advantages alone. If the application of the clause were limited, in the Japanese treaties, to commercial advantages alone, and if political, judicial and personal rights were excluded from its action, the Japanese Government might perhaps be disposed to abandon the interpretation, as unnecessary.

Lambertmont. We will discuss later the two points on which you have replied to me, when the Japanese Government has sent instructions upon them; but, as you have said nothing with reference to the first of the English claims—liberty of trade—I will make an observation thereon myself. M. Maeda has been a good deal in Belgium, and he

informed us that his object is to exclude foreigners from all direct trade with Japan and to monopolise that trade in Japanese hands; he gives me a copy of his pamphlet to that effect. As we know, by long experience, that dreams of this sort are unrealisable and that always ends by following its natural channels, whatever be the efforts of Governments or of theorists to divert it from them, we took no notice of M. Maeda's projects of monopoly and did our best to help him as a pioneer of commerce. But still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that M. Maeda was, officially, an agent of his Government, and that, in that quality, he professed intentions absolutely hostile to the interests of Europe. However fruitless his efforts may be, however contrary to experience and to practical possibility his ideas may be, he *is* making those efforts and he *does* express those ideas, and he does this as Commissary of the Japanese Government for Commerce. Consequently, I do not think I am attaching undue importance to his attitude when I say that we saw in it a bad symptom, and

that, coupling it with the direct and indirect proceedings of the Japanese Government itself in supporting monopolies, in fostering opposition to certain foreign branches of trade, and in trying (as it is constantly doing) to drive trade into particular hands, we feel uneasiness as to the action which the Japanese Government might adopt if it were free to follow its own desires. For these reasons I spoke to M. Ito that we view M. Maeda's plans with mistrust, as being both unsound in theory and unrealisable in practice; M. Ito assured me that I need attach no importance to them; but still, I am obliged to recognise that they form part of the subject as a whole, and, with all respect for M. Ito's explanations, we shall have to take them into account when we determine the conditions which we must attach to the revised commercial treaty. Be convinced that, on this point, all Europe will take the same general view as we do; although Belgium alone, so far as I know, has been made acquainted with the projects of M. Maeda, you will, therefore, do well to urge M.

Hachisuka to draw the attention of his Government to this question, for, assuredly, all Europe will agree in claiming that the trade of Japan shall be *free*.

I will now pass to another subject. France has decided to propose new conditions for the revision of the Japanese treaties. This action of France will be regarded with some surprise, for, hitherto, she has shown indifference to the subject and has seemed disinclined to move in it. I think I am not wrong in supposing that this sudden movement on the part of France will be attributed, generally, to a desire to favorably influence Japan in the event of difficulties between France and China; and I suspect that that interpretation will not be advantageous to Japan, for it will provoke the feeling that France is not putting forward her plan of terminability solely because she believes it to be right, but mainly because it suits her interests in another direction to try to make friends with Japan. Consequently, the initiative of France in the matter will not be regarded with the same

confidence as if it sprang, evidently and exclusively, from a sense of what is just towards Japan.

Marshall. It would be idle to pretend, under the circumstances, that I do not admit your argument in *part*, but, as the entire negotiation with France in this matter is known to me, I am able to assure you positively that the decision of France as to the revision has been mainly brought about by considerations altogether independent of affairs in China. That those affairs have had *some* influence is manifest and I do not for an instant deny that we have profited by a good opportunity; but I assure you, in all sincerity, that the action of France has resulted, really, from totally different causes—from long discussion, from a careful examination of the case, and, somewhat, from the growing disposition of France to take a place in the outgoing affairs of Europe.

Lambermont. I believe you. But others, who do not hear you, will, probably, remain convinced of the contrary, and I repeat that this sudden action of France will be viewed with some mistrust. You

must not regard it as conclusive ; it is an element, an important element, of the subject as a whole, but it is only an element and it will not decide Europe. The English circular is also an element. And the German note will have much weight. The attitude of Belgium will be most friendly towards Japan ; of that I can assure you ; we do not share in the opinion which seems to exist in certain places that Japan must be held fast, we feel that, on the contrary, we must treat her as her progress deserves ; but I say once more what I have many times said to you, that we regard that progress as somewhat superficial, and that our action will be proportioned to the condition of Japan, as we believe it to be in reality. Never forget that. And we must take account of all that our neighbours may say. I think you might assist in hastening a solution if you could get Italy to support you a little more than she does. Italy shows only a languid interest about Japan ; but as she is a great power and has important commercial dealings with you, it would seem natural that she should come

and Baron Lambermont.

*Lambergmont.* The German Minister has delivered the Note prepared by his Government on the revision of the treaties with Japan, and the French Minister brought to me this morning a copy of the answer of his Government to the English Circular on the same question. Consequently, we are now informed, in an exact manner, of the views entertained on the subject in Berlin and Paris. You know what the French say, and I have done my best to persuade the German Minister to authorize me to tell you what the Germans say, but the German Gov't has always treated this matter with a certain secrecy and I have not been able to obtain permission from the German Minister to show you the Berlin Note or even to state to you its substance. Of course, however, Mr. Aoki can get a copy of it and then you will know as much as I do. For the moment I can only say that the German Note is by no means unsatisfactory; in certain points indeed, it is clearer than I expected

forward a little more in the matter. Holland is active about it and speaks of Japan in friendly terms. Spain is silent—too silent for the country which owns the Philippines and which has, therefore, important interests in China Seas. As all the Governments will have to agree I think you should press them all on, especially Italy.

Marshall. I will report what you have said to me.

Lambermont. But I must make a condition about that. All I have said is purely personal ; I have spoken to you as a friend, and in no degree as a representative of the Belgian Government. With that restriction I authorise you to report my words. My Government is in no way engaged by them and remains as free as if I had said nothing.

附屬書三

十六年七月十三日マルシャル氏ト白耳義外務大輔トノ對話書

Brussels, 13 July 1883.

Conversation between Marshall

in the expression of friendly dispositions towards Japan. As regards terminability it goes, I think, in some respects, a little further than the French proposal ; but its plan is different. I can give you no further information on it at present ; all I can do is to repeat that it is not at all an unsatisfactory document and that I have no doubt it will please you, on the whole, when you learn what it says.

Our own Note is nearly ready. I shall now complete it as soon as possible, adding what we have to say about the French and German proposals. France goes a long way (further even than Japan asked at the end of the Tokio Conference) in proposing to apply the principle of terminability to the entire treaty, including jurisdiction. I do not know exactly how we shall treat that. It is probable that we shall adopt neither the French nor the German view and that we shall propose something else. But I can assure you that you will be quite satisfied with our tone when you see the note.

The action of France has been of more use to



you than I expected and you did right to get it rumoured about that France had decided to propose the principle of terminability. I do not suppose, for an instant, that the opinion of France decided the opinion of Germany but I do incline to think that it has not been without some effect in Berlin and even that it may, perhaps, have hurried on the completion and delivery of the German Note which I was not led to expect so soon. And all this has exercised a certain influence here also. As I have already told you, the action of France will not be in any way decisive; it will inspire less confidence and produce less direct results than the action of Germany but it has served you, indirectly, more than I thought possible a week ago, for it has not only brought forward, for the first time, the idea of terminability for the whole treaty, but, by a singular coincidence, the answers of many other Governments have followed it immediately, almost as if it had pressed them on. Most of the Gov'ts have sent their replies to London during the last few days and England now knows what the greater

that principle is to be applied and I imagine that there will be much discussion on that head and that several plans will be suggested before a conclusion is reached.

*Marshall.* I thank you much for this information and for the opinions you have expressed. When will you be able to show me the Belgian Note in answer to England?

*Lambermont.* Not immediately. I be ready before you leave for Switzerland. It will not be quite finished for some days yet, when it is complete the Minister must approve it and the King must see it and then it must be delivered in London. It is only after it has been delivered in London that I can show it to you and then you will no longer be here. But, really, I regard the language of all these Notes as having no great importance as concerns the final result. It is far more interesting for you to be aware of their general spirit than to know the details of their wording. The details are sure to be changed before we reach their application but the general spirit will, I

part of Europe thinks.

The Continental Powers are divided, in this matter, into two classes; there is a minority which regards the question with interest which studies it closely and takes trouble about it; but that minority includes only Germany, France and Belgium; and there is a majority which is almost indifferent. The states which compose that majority seem to have answered England by simply echoing the proposals contained in her Circular and by accepting them, more or less completely. Even Italy is acting in that careless fashion. I do not, however, suppose that the replies so given are to be regarded as quite definitive and I dare say that if Germany urges those states to modify their replies they will be disposed to do so. Consequently, the question, as I view it, lies between England on one side, representing the idea of permanence, and Germany, France and Belgium on the other side, representing the idea of terminability in some form to be determined. If England yields as regards the principle then the Governments will have to agree how

hope, be durable and of that general spirit I have informed you. It is good. So wait in hope, and do your utmost to persuade the Japanese Gov't to content itself with possibilities, to take what it can get now, not to ask for every thing at once, and to leave for the future what cannot be effected in the present. The revision of the Tarif, as a separate arrangement will apparently be accepted everywhere, and I think we shall be able to assist the Japanese Gov't a little by drawing attention in the Belgian Note to some other commercial questions which were discussed at the Tokio Conference and which can probably be settled at the same time but of which no other European Power has yet spoken.

The next step must be taken by England. It is for her to reply to the various Notes which are being addressed to her. She is not likely to hurry about that and it would be useless to attempt to hurry her. My advice to you is to leave her alone for the present, for, perhaps she will not be altogether pleased with the attitude which France,

Germany and Belgium have taken. I dare say we shall learn nothing distinct from her till September or October, and, after that, there will of course be, a further exchange of views between all the Powers before anything can be said to Japan. Meanwhile you will be able to collect information as to the dispositions of the various Gov'ts and, by degrees, the shape of the communication which will ultimately be addressed to Japan will shadow itself out to you. When you return here from Berne I may have more to tell you. I repeat that you have every reason to be satisfied with the results you have obtained and with the form which the affair is taking. I had no expectation that any Government could be led, at present, to such action in the matter. I will only add that, as I have always wished to assist you I am extremely glad that the change of circumstances enables the Belgian Government to express its views in a manner which is likely to be good.

英國轉回

○ 十六年十月十四日イギリス外務省からベルギー外務省へ

*Marshall.* It was agreed at the Foreign Office in Paris that the answer of France to the English Circular should include a reference to the desirability of examining the question of administrative control over foreigners in Japan. I was, therefore, surprised to see that the answer makes no mention of that subject.

*Montebello.* That is true. I noticed that the question is set forth in the confidential Note sent to the French chargé d'Affaires in London (a copy of which has been transmitted to me) and that it is omitted in the official letter. I do not know why. I suppose it must have been forgotten. You had better write to the Commercial Director in Paris about it. And I will read to you the Confidential Note sent to London. It will interest you. Of course no one must know that you have heard it, for it is an absolutely private document intended for French agents alone.

Count Montebello then read that note. It gives a history of the revision negotiations, states the various phases through which those negotiations

Brussels, 13 July 1883.

Conversation between Marshall and  
Count de Montebello, French Minister  
in Belgium.

*Marshall.* I am much obliged to you for sending me the text of the French answer to the English Circular. Have you communicated it to the Belgian Government?

*Montebello.* Yes, I took it this morning to Baron Lambermont and left it with him. I was glad to learn from him that our idea of terminability for Japan<sup>(519)</sup> treaties is regarded with sympathy by the Belgian Government and that they are disposed to follow us in proposing terminability to England. I think from what Baron Lambermont said, that, though they agree with us as to the principle, they will not propose quite the same plan as we do. That, however, is a matter of small importance; what Japan wants, first of all, is to get Europe to take the great step of admitting the *idea*; the way of working it out will be selected afterwards.

have successively passed, alludes to the proposals contained in the English Circular, mentions the non-official negotiations with Marshall, and sets forth the programme privately communicated by him. It then says, not in exact words, but in substance. In consequence of the private communications just referred to, we were led to consider carefully, before replying to the English Circular, the possibility of consenting to the desire of Japan for a terminable treaty. The objections thereto are manifest, and three of them have particular weight; first the strong objection made by England; secondly, the doubt which we ourselves entertain as to the manner in which Japan might use freedom if it were conceded to her; thirdly, the difficulties which an abandonment of our present permanent treaty with Japan might create as regards our relations with China. But, after weighing these objections, after hearing the arguments which were non-officially brought before us in support of the claim of Japan, we incline to the opinion that, under all the circumstances, the ob-

jection do not suffice to justify us in insisting, as the English Government does, that the present treaty shall be maintained as an unchangeable permanent engagement. And, yet, we hesitate to propose any plan in complete contradiction with the views of the English Government, especially, as those views, may not improbably, be shared, more or less, by other Government. Consequently, we have decided to suggest a solution which would involve no precipitate action in the matter and would entail no difficulties of immediate application, but which would offer to Japan a moral satisfaction in the present and would ensure to her the liberty she desires in the future. We hope that this moderate and conciliatory attitude will be appreciated by the English Government and that it may serve to bring about an arrangement which would satisfy all parties.

Count Montebello then said, I think this is wise language and I hope that our assistance will help you to a conclusion.

I report to Paris that my first impression as to

revision prepared by the end of this year.

Baron Lambertmont (who is acting towards me with wonderful kindness, as the enclosed Note testifies). sees, however, a doubtful point. He is uncertain as to the manner in which England may receive the proposals of termination put forward by France, Germany and Belgium, and fears that she may be much vexed by them. He will do all he can to lead her to accept them, but, in order to diminish the possibility of a precipitate refusal on her part, he asked me to write to Mr. Plunkett (who, as you know, is a friend of mine) begging him to try to prevent the Foreign Office from adopting hastily a negative decision. I have therefore sent a letter to Mr. Plunkett in that sense.

It is considered by the European diplomats whom I have been able to consult that the proposals now made by France, Germany and Belgium go so much beyond anything that looked possible a few months ago, that Japan ought to accept them instantly with joy. And I see clearly that claims of new concession would do harm to the interests of

the dispositions of the Belgian Government is that they are will inclined towards the principle of our proposal and that I hope they will support it, or, at all events, something like it.

二六八 明治十六年八月三日 伊藤参議宛

歐洲事情報告ノ件 (二)

附屬書 十六年八月三日附峰須賀公使來信附屬書  
ヤハ報告

Copy

Berne, 2 August 1883.

Dear Mr. Ito.

I enclose the translation of the Belgian Note in answer to the English Circular (marked F).

Your Excellency will see by it that our affairs have got on rapidly since I wrote to you on 19 July. They have, indeed, progressed so fast and so far that it has become possible to imagine that the replies of the Powers to the claims made by Japan at the Conference may be decided and the plan of

Japan, because such claims would be regarded fresh evidence of what has been so often said to me by Europeans, that Japan fails to comprehend the realities of her situation and that, consequently, she has made but little progress in political education. For these reasons I am sure it is my duty to entreat Your Excellency to seize the opportunity which now offers, to accept the proposals directly they reach Tokio, and to carry the revision as rapidly as possible to a signature. Of course I do not mean that Japan should not ask for modifications of those proposals; but I am convinced that, if she wishes for modifications, they should be asked for at once, in Europe, non-officially, before the Powers have come to a decision, and not be deferred until their answers have been delivered in Japan. Your government has been made acquainted, confidentially with the probable nature of the coming proposals and is able, therefore, to immediately form an opinion on them and to determine the points on which (if any) modifications should be suggested, privately, while there is still time to

get them considered here. I much regret that a Director of the Negotiations is not now present in Europe and I still indulge the hope that a plenipotentiary may be sent at once. Failing that, it is indispensable to transmit immediate telegraphic instructions to your agents as to the views entertained by your Government on the proposals of Europe, so far as they are yet known.

When the effort has been made, confidentially of course, to obtain the modifications you may desire (if any) we shall have reached the maximum of present possibilities and you will know exactly in what form the revision can be made. The details only would then remain for settlement in Japan.

The principle on which the present proposals of terminability rest is that the realisation of terminability shall depend on Japan herself. If the plan is adopted as it stands an early date would be fixed for that realisation, on the two conditions that Japan shall be ready when that date arrives and that Europe shall be the judge as to whether Japan is ready. This means, particularly, that the

communicate cordially and unreservedly with each other and contribute equally to the common end, no general or satisfactory results can be looked for. With the new and most delicate duties which all the Legations will be called upon to discharge, after the revision is signed, in leading Europe to have confidence in Japan, so as to facilitate the realisation of terminability at the date fixed, it will become more urgent than ever that the Legations should be placed under one able master, well acquainted with Europe and European ways, endowed with the capacity of winning friends, and perfectly determined to make every—one of his subordinates do his duty, without the slightest consideration of persons.

I have communicated this letter to Mr. Hachisuka: he asks me to say to you that he entirely approves it.

My wife and daughter send their kindest regards, and I beg you to believe me

dear Mr. Ito,

your very faithful servant,

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 二九八

whole country shall be open, just as Europe is, and that the new Codes shall be in such a satisfactory state of application, in the opinion of European Government, that Japanese jurisdiction can be accepted everywhere with confidence.

By far the greater share of this work must be done in Japan, and, of course, I have nothing to say thereon. But there is an essential part of it which will have to be performed in Europe: opinion must be prepared and formed here so that it may cordially admit termination when the time comes. It is the function of the Legations to execute that part of the work.

It is for the Japanese Government to recognize this, to carefully select the agents to whom they will confide this difficult and important task, and to determine the nature and extent of the means of action which they will place at their disposal. All I will permit myself to say about it is that without an organized and competent diplomatic service and without a chief to hold the Legations together and to see, on the spot, that they all

sig. Frederick Marshall.

I reopen my letter, at the last moment, to add most interesting news, which I have just obtained in strict confidence. The reason why England has asked for permanence of the treaties, and why she may refuse to accept the terminability proposed by France, Germany and Belgium, is that Parkes has persuaded the Foreign Office that a violent revolution will follow the proclamation of the Constitution in Japan. Consequently, it is said and believed at the Foreign Office that it is impossible to set Japan free from the treaties with such a state of things impending.

註 添附書類ナシラン Belgian Note ナルモノ 可ハベ  
大號文書ハ略ホ之ヲ明ニシタルモノナリヲ認メラル

附屬書

十六年八月二日附在白峰須賀公使來信附屬マルシヤル報告

Brussels, 21 July 1883.

The Belgian Note.

Marshall again asked Baron Lamermont to allow

him to have a copy of the Belgian Note in answer to the English Circular.

Baron Lambertont replied that, since he last saw Marshall the German Minister had particularly begged him not to communicate the Belgian Note to Japanese agents, saying that it ought to be regarded as a confidential communication, like the English and German Notes. Baron Lambertont said that this request for secrecy placed him in an awkward position and that he did not know how he could, under such circumstances, let Marshall see the Note. Furthermore he remarked that, in any event, it would be altogether contrary to usage to acquaint Marshall with the terms of the Note before it was delivered in London, which it would not be till the following week. To this Marshall answered by expressing much regret, as he was obliged to leave for Switzerland in four days and had indulged the hope that he would be able to see the Note before he started. He then proposed to come back on purpose from Berne at any date which Baron Lambertont might fix. The latter would not hear of

this, said that it was unnecessary to take so much trouble about it, that Marshall must leave him to consider the matter, that it was extremely delicate, but that he would see what he could do ultimately and would write to Marshall.

Finally, however, after a quarter of an hour more of conversation and hesitation, Baron Lambertont said, most kindly, that, after all, as Marshall was going away, he would give him the Note at once. But he attached three conditions to the communication; the first, that no stranger should know that it had been made; the second, that no Japanese agent (excepting Mr. Hachisuka) should be told anything about it for a week, so as to give time for the delivery of the Note in London; the third, that the words should be sufficiently altered in Marshall's copy to enable Baron Lambertont to say to the German Minister that he had not given the text to Marshall.

Baron Lambertont then dictated to Marshall the following analysis of the Note, he and Marshall reading the Note together as they went on. The

changes introduced in the words are of no importance; the sense remains absolutely exact.

The Note begins by setting forth the proposal made by Japan in the Tokio Conference, at the sitting of 17 July 1882, to the effect that a separate Convention should be made for the revision of Commercial affairs.

It then says that Belgium is disposed to agree to this proposal and to make a separate Commercial Convention, reserving for future discussion the question of jurisdiction and other non-commercial matters.

It adopts, in a general manner, the project of tariff proposed at the Conference, subject to the conversion, by the sub-commission, of ad valorem duties into specific duties, as arranged at the Conference.

It alludes to the promise of the Japanese Delegates (See observation No. 1) at the Conference that the increased products of the new customs duties shall be employed to improve the monetary situation in Japan.

It states that, in addition to the Commercial Regulations which have been referred by the Conference to the sub-commission, it would be desirable to settle, simultaneously, the questions which have been discussed at the Conference, such as Light Dues, Drawbacks, Bonded Warehouses, Wrecks, and other analogous matters of less importance. Such subjects as artistic and literary property, trade marks, industrial patterns, patents, etc. might be dealt with either in the same convention or by separate arrangements.

It claims that the relations between foreign traders and Japanese producers and consumers must not be submitted to any restrictions contrary to the spirit of the treaties; this matter might be settled either by the Convention or by official correspondence.

It observed that improvements should be introduced into the system of passports.

It announces that Belgium would not refuse to take part in a negotiation as to the rights of police over foreigners which might be granted to Japan,

under certain guarantees (See Observation No. 2), and in exchange for larger liberties to be granted to foreigners in other matters (See Observation No. 3).

It points out that the favoured nations clause in the Belgian Treaty with Japan (Article 19) is absolute and without conditions. It proposes to maintain this clause unchanged so far as tariff, port and navigation dues and commercial regulations are concerned, and also to maintain it as regards favours of other natures; but it suggests the admission (See Observation No. 4), as regards the latter, of a disposition analogous to that contained in the convention of 31 March 1880 between China and Germany.

Finally, the Note takes up the question of duration. It says that Belgium has always considered the question of duration of the treaties in correlation with the opening of the country and with a satisfactory state of things as regards justice and administration towards foreigners. Belgium recognises that considerable progress has been already effected;

Lambermont was good enough to read to Marshall, confidentially, three other documents;

1. The official letter sent, with the Note, to the Belgian Minister in London.
2. The confidential Note of explanations sent with that letter.

3. Baron Lambermont's own private letter on the subject to the Belgian Minister in London.

The sense of these documents is the same, generally, as that of the Note itself.

Copies of the Belgian Note will be at once specially communicated, by the Belgian Ministers, to the Governments of Rome and Madrid, in the hope of leading them to quicker action and to more good-will than they have hitherto shown.

註 一 蜂須賀公使來信ノ本信ニ當リモハ綴込簿冊中見當リ  
ス、何本又書ハ前綴込簿冊頭ハ Belgian Note ナ  
ルモノヲ略ホ明記ニセルモノナリト認メタル

#### Observations.

No. 1. Baron Lambermont mentioned that the German Note asks for guarantees that the promise

she believes the declaration made at the Conference that reforms will be continued; and the Note remarks that it is certainly the interest of both Japan and the Powers that Japan should persevere in the road she is following.

(The words which come next are translated textually).

"In order to encourage Japan therein, a date would be fixed (say 8 or 10 years hence) at which she would reacquire the position of other States as regards treaty engagements, on condition that she shall have settled, at that time, the opening of the entire country in a manner which shall be approved by the other Governments." (See Observation No. 5).

The conclusions of the Note are that a Commercial Convention, including accessory questions, shall be signed as soon as possible, and that negotiations shall continue with Japan in order to examine all the arrangements which may conduce to a satisfactory opening of the country.

After concluding this analysis of the Note, Baron

made at the Conference that the increased products of the new Customs duties shall be employed to improve the monetary situation, shall be carried into execution.

No. 2. Baron Lambermont stated, particularly, that he did not know whether the question of police rights could be dealt with in the Commercial Convention, or whether it would be included in the category of points reserved for future consideration. Explanation thereon will be exchanged with Berlin and London.

No. 3. Marshall asked Baron Lambermont what he meant by "larger liberties" for foreigners. Baron Lambermont answered that he did not yet exactly know what form the Belgian Government might give to their claim of "larger liberties" to be granted by Japan in exchange for certain police rights over foreigners. His object at present is only to indicate that there must be reciprocity, in some shape. He supposed, however, that the "larger liberties" to be claimed by Belgium would take the form of facilities for travelling in the interior.

No. 4. Baron Lambermont mentioned that it would be useful if the Japanese Government were to inform European Governments, officially, of its views as regards the meaning and the application of the favoured nations clause, and insisted on the impossibility of ever admitting that any differential duty could be enacted in Japan in favour or any Power.

No. 5. Baron Lambermont stated that by "a manner which shall be approved by the other Governments", he meant what is said on page 9, that, at the moment of terminability, there shall be, in the opinion of foreign Governments, "a satisfactory state of things as regards justice and administration towards foreigners". If, at the date fixed, foreign Governments should not consider that state of things to be "satisfactory", the termination of the treaties would be delayed until they did consider it to be "satisfactory".

## 二九六

伊藤博文外相の報告（伊藤博文外相の報告）

adopted at the Foreign office. It was mainly in consequence of this that England stated to the Powers, in the Circular of April, that she "has no intention of modifying the permanent character of the treaties with Japan".

Sir J. Pauncefote, in his conversations with certain foreign representatives in London has taken a tone of such marked hostility to Japan and has spoken so unfavourably of the Japanese that some of those representatives have specially reported his unfriendly words to their Governments.

This explains why so much doubt has been expressed of late in Paris and Brussels as to whether England can be brought to accept terminability at all, even if all the Continental Powers agree to it.

The enmity of Sir H. Parkes towards Japan and the entire control which he has acquired over Sir J. Pauncefote are at the bottom of this situation, and the departure of Sir H. Parkes for China is not likely to produce any immediate change in the conduct of the Foreign Office. He has, unfortunately, established views there which may last for some

## 英政府有期條約反對事情報告ノ件

Strictly Confidential Note

Berne, 15 August 1883.

When the Japanese Government announced the intention to establish a Constitution in 1890 Sir H. Parkes wrote immediately to the English Foreigners in Tokio and of several important Japanese functionaries, a revolution will, in all probability, break out at the moment of applying that Constitution. He went on to say that this probability of internal troubles created a new and peremptory reason for declining to admit any idea of terminability for the treaties, because it would, evidently, be impossible to set Japan free and to submit foreigners to her control just at the time when she may be expected to be in a state of grave political disturbance.

As Sir J. Pauncefote had been completely gained over and turned against Japan by Sir H. Parkes, during the recent stay of the latter in England, this statement was believed and this argument was

time.

Furthermore, as it is known that, when the Chinese Mission come to Tokio with reference to Liou Kiou, Sir H. Parkes did his utmost to privately influence the Chinese against Japan, it is reasonable to fear that he will continue the same efforts at Peking. In the present state of the relations between China and Japan it will be wise to regard with deep mistrust the policy which he may follow at Peking.

註 伊藤參議宛ノ報告ト思ハル

三〇〇 明治十六年八月十日

光妙寺代理公使ヨリ  
吉田外務卿代理宛

## 新任佛國公使ト會談ノ件

機 第四拾九號

一 昨八日新任公使「シアンキヅイク」氏ヲ訪問イタシ條約改正一件少々問試候得共漠然タル談話ノミニ有之候同氏ノ所言ノ大要ハ貿易條約ハ兩國ノ利益ノ爲メ妥協ノ點ニ歸着ス可ク裁判權ノ問題ハ面倒ナル事ニテ實況ヲ看察スル上ナ

ラテハ自己ノ意見モ申陳難致云々ニ有之候

英政府廻文ニ關スル當政府回答ノ始末問試候處汎然タル返事イタシ居候右ハ未發ニハ無之哉ト被想像候(是ハ三郎一已ノ想像ニ止ル)其他話次立合裁判 (jurisdiction mixte) ノ事ニ及候間右ハ我外務卿ノ拒却スル事タルヲ話シ會議録中我發案ト一般通例ノ立合裁判トノ大異ヲ辯明イタシ置候右ハ同氏埃及多日在職セシヲ以テ立合裁判說ヲ主張スルカノ様ニ見受候故致話及候次第ニ有之候  
同氏ハ今明日中米國通リニテ致出發候  
右中進候也

明治十六年八月十日

駐佛臨時代理公使 光妙寺三郎

外務卿代理外務大輔吉田清成殿

三〇一 明治十六年九月十三日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛政府ノ對英回答ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十六年八月三十日附蜂須賀公使宛往電

二 十六年九月三日附蜂須賀公使宛往電

次便詳細可申述奉存候

顧問格マルシヤルヘ申付即今佛政府ニ對シ同政府ガ英政府ヘ回答ノ一義ニ付我ヨリ修正ヲ請求スルハ甚難事ナル理由爲相認差出候間宜事情御波察ニ預リ度奉存候且マルシヤル白國外務大輔ランベルモン氏ト談話書是又差出申候右書中白政府ノ模様ノミナラズ瑞西政府ノ模様其他白政府ノ發議ニ對シ各國ヨリ意見ヲ附シ回答致候次第委曲分明ニ有之御參考可相成存候ニ付不取敢公便呈進致シ候他ハ次ノ英郵便ニ相讓リ差急草々如此御座候也

十六年九月十三日

外務卿 殿

茂 韶 敬 白

註 一二九六文書

附屬書一

一號 十六年八月三十日附蜂須賀公使宛往電  
(佛政府ノ對英回答ニ關スル件)

Japanese Minister

Petersburg

To Hachisuka. Copy of French Foreign Minister's instruction to French Chargé in London received.

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇一

三 十六年九月十二日發蜂須賀公使來電

四 十六年九月八日白國外務大輔トマルシアル氏トノ對話書

五 十六年九月六日附マルシアル報告書

十一月一日到

拜啓條約改正ニ關シ佛政府ヨリ英政府ヘ送致候回答ノ義ニ付別紙電信寫改第一號二號ノ通御示令有之改第三號寫ノ通昨日發電致置候

機密第十九號七月十四日附ノ貴信本月八日接到佛清兩國ノ葛藤ニ關シ我ヨリ佛政府ニ向フテハ陰ニ清國ノ屬邦主義ヲ排斥シ佛國ノ論旨ヲ贊成スルノ意ヲ含ミ程好ク談話可致旨委曲敬承御訓令厚ク遵奉可致候  
同機密信ヲ以テ條約改正ニ係ル

閣下ト森青木兩公使トノ機密往復信ヲ添ヘ御示令ノ趣致承知候右改正事件ハ前述改第一號電信ヲ以テ御訓令ノ次第モ有之一昨十一日并ニ昨十二日當ブリュクセル府ニ於テ森青木兩公使ト會合各其意見ヲ交通致シ大幸ノ至リニ御座候尙今後益協同盡力可致候

右會合談話ノ要件并ニ條約有期主義ニ係ル御訓令ノ條々今便開陳可致等ニ有之候得共發信日ニ差迫リ難得其義候ニ付

Termination although couched with different words is in spirit and principle the same as English. Not at all satisfactory. This is the most important point. While I do not care if the termination is fixed at ten or even 15 years, I cannot omit its express statement in the new treaty itself. Then again, no mention of administrative regulations is made. Let Marshall use all effort to secure these ends. Mori and Aoki will go to Paris. Consult with them and together make earnest effort with Italy. (可ト會合)

Inouye.

附屬書二

二號 十六年九月三日附蜂須賀公使宛往電

Japanese Minister

Petersburg

To Hachisuka. Received copies of conversation of Marshall with Lambermont and Montebello. The present is the most important moment. I am not satisfied with only terminability morally given to us. Also the want of mention of administrative regulations is unsatisfactory. Therefore in pursuance of my telegram of 30 ult., use every effort upon



Lambermont and proper French Authorities to effect these ends.

Inouye.

附圖書三

三號 十六年九月十二日發蜂須賀公使來電

Gaimukio,

In reply to your telegram about the French note, many reasons not to ask France now to modify note, full explanations by post. Marshall never ventured to ask France clear termination because we know if we had asked for that, the whole would have failed. All we could ask, as matters then stood, was the principle of termination in opposition to principle of permanence proposed by England and this was done. Have learnt confidently French Minister for Foreign Affairs has informed the Belgian Minister in Paris that French proposal of moral termination will not do, and he seemed rather inclined to adopt Belgian plan. Mori, Aoki agree with my opinion not to press France.

Hachisuka.

12 September, 1883.

done hitherto.

Lambermont. I have already asked our Minister at Berne to speak to the Federal Government about the objections made by the Cabinet of Tokio to the exercise of judicial power by trading Consuls. Belgium has only one Consul de carrière in Japan, and Switzerland has none at all; Belgium and Switzerland are therefore especially concerned in the question and I thought we might be able to adopt common action upon it. My feeling is that the objections made by Japan are very legitimate and I am disposed to see what we can do to meet the wishes of Japan in the matter. It was in this spirit that I told our Minister at Berne to confer with the Swiss Government. Here is his reply, dated 11 August. He says, you see that the Swiss Government considers that it is "impossible" to limit the right of exercising judicial functions to Consuls de carrière alone, but he adds that the Federal Council seems not disinclined to adopt the idea which I suggested of delegating those functions as much as possible, in practice, from trading Consuls to Con-

附圖書四

十六年九月八日白國外務大輔マレンシヤン氏への電話書

Confidential

Brussels, 8 September, 1883.

Conversation between Baron  
Lambermont and Marshall.

Marshall. I wrote to you from Switzerland to say that I expected the French Government would follow Germany in the revision negotiations. But when Mr. Hachisuka saw the President of the Confederation, the latter made objections to the German plan, stated that its wording was not clear, said that he had asked for explanations from Berlin, and expressed the opinion that the Swiss Government would incline rather to the English view. Under these circumstances we should be very much obliged if you would instruct the Belgian Minister at Berne to join his efforts to those of the German representative, in order to press Switzerland to follow the guidance of Germany, as she has always

suls de carrière of *other nationalities* so as to get over the difficulty.

In my instructions to our Minister at Berne I have touched, thus far, on no other point than this one, but I will now, immediately, send a fresh communication with reference to the revision as a whole. I will forward a copy of the Belgian Note and I will tell our agent to urge the Swiss to go with Germany and Belgium and not with England.

Marshall. Have you been informed that, in addition to commercial reasons, the motive of England in maintaining permanence is that she believes there will be a revolution in Japan when the promised Constitution is proclaimed in 1890, and that she will not consent to terminate the treaties with such a disturbance in prospect?

Lambermont. No, I have not heard that, but I am glad to be informed that such an impression exists because I can try to combat it surely the plans of terminability put forward by Germany and by ourselves would furnish ample guarantees in such a case, for their essential condition is to make

the realization of terminability dependent on the progress and condition of Japan. It is for Japan to *earn* the terminability which we are disposed to offer her, and she must earn it by political quiet as well as by general advance towards our ideas of civilization. I have already begun to draft the detailed text of a scheme of terminability for consideration by the Powers hereafter, and I will incorporate in it an allusion to the political state of the country so far as to remove, if possible, the fears which you say are felt in London.

Marshall. I hope you will be good enough to show me that draft when you have finished it.

Lamermont. Certainly. But it will not be ready yet, for I must wait to see how things turn. It appears to me that there are beginning to be signs that several Continental Governments view the Belgian plan with approbation, they seem to regard it as practical and as being clearer in language than the German Note, and I should not be surprised if, in the end, it were adopted as a basis. The French Government appears disposed to adhere

Government inclines to what it calls a policy of conciliation".

Our representative at St. Petersburg tells me that Russia had not yet answered the English Note, but that "she will probably follow the German proposal".

From Madrid I learn that the Spanish Government began by accepting the English plan, but that, "recognizing afterwards the tendency of Europe to admit a conciliatory formula, Spain will now accept the point of view of the majority" (here Baron Lamermont observed, with a smile, "that makes one more, for we have already the majority").

Our Minister at the Hague says, in general terms, that Holland accepts the views of Germany and Belgium.

From Stockholm I am informed that, "though the Swedish Government does not wish to take any formal engagement for the moment, it considers that the Belgian plan would form, hereafter, an excellent basis for negotiation".

From Vienna we have no news, but I suppose we

to it. I received, during the month of August, answers from those of our agents abroad through whom I communicated the Belgian Note to foreign Governments. Here are those answers; I will read them all to you, so that you may know exactly what our neighbours are thinking.

We will begin with France. Our Minister in Paris says, "M. Challengel Lacour has expressed to me the opinion that the purely moral plan of terminability contained in his answer to the English Note is not of an acceptable or realisable nature. He recognized that it is a formula of a kind, and that it is expressed in terms, which are not usual in international documents. He added that he fully appreciated the practical merit of the Belgian proposal, and, though he did not say that he would adopt it, he gave me to understand that he was favorably inclined towards it".

From Rome our representative writes that "no definitive resolution has been taken yet by the Italian Government as to the duration of the treaties. But in its answer to the English Circular the

may expect that Austria will follow Germany.

Consequently, you see what the Continent thinks and you ought to be very satisfied with the news.

Of the ideas of England I know nothing, absolutely nothing. Not one word has been said yet by the Foreign Office to the Belgian Minister in London. I can, therefore, give you no information. But the moment I learn anything I will tell you. The position of England is not quite easy. She opened her communication to Europe by declaring, with marked positiveness that she will not abandon the permanence of the treaties, and now she finds that she is almost alone in that view and that nearly every one else inclines to the opposite impression. I am curious to see how she will deal with the situation.

Marshall. Have you heard a report that the United States have intervened to bring about an arrangement between France and China?

Lamermont. There have been newspaper paragraphs to that effect, and it would be quite in accordance with the recent attitude of America if she tried to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

But I do not suppose there is any truth in the story, because, if such an intervention had really taken place it would certainly have become known already. Europe is watching with such keen interest the march of affairs between France and China and has expressed so unmistakably her disapprobation of the action of France, that America would have been delighted to announce her mediation, if it really existed. She would have been regarded as a public benefactor. Furthermore, the idea of a European mediation, in some shape, has been gaining ground during the last two or three days, and it is evident that no European mediation would be wanted if the United States had already stepped in. No, I do not believe the story.

支那の外交

十六年九月五日（一九一九年九月五日）

Brussels, 6 September, 1883.

Memorandum on the position of the negotiations between Japan and France.

sion, France should (have) a latent spirit of fairness towards Japan, and, when pressed, exhibited faint sympathy and good will. For instance, in April 1880, she expressed, in writing (in answer to the five points submitted by Mr. Sameshimā) a theoretical disposition to admit the idea of terminability and to grant a few other conditions of a relatively generous kind.

So things stood until the beginning of 1883. In March arrived a letter from Mr. Inouye instructing Marshall to try to induce France to recognise that China was going too far, both for France and for Japan, in the matter of suzerainty over the States adjacent to her. France declined to admit this view and preserved her habitual attitude of indifference to the objects and interests of Japan.

At the end of April she suddenly took up another tone. Marshall was informed that, in consequence of change of circumstances in Tonkin, France had, at last, recognised that she had some interests in common with Japan and was disposed to adopt some sort of undefined joint action with Japan towards

When the question of revising the Japanese treaties first came before Europe, France took up an attitude of indifference towards Japan. Her Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed, repeatedly, during several years, in private conversations, the opinion that France had nothing to care about in Japan, and that though she would probably, in the end, act as other European nations might act in the matter, she would take no initiative therein and would hold to the present treaty as long as she possibly could.

France gave several reasons for this attitude. She said, in substance, that her position in Europe was delicate and difficult, that her whole thoughts were absorbed by that position, that her trade with Japan was small and her political interests there null, that she would only create difficulties with her European neighbours by assuming an active position in the Japanese revision, and that she wished to trouble herself as little as possible about that revision.

Still, in spite of all this carelessness about revision,

China.

In the meantime, however, the Japanese Government had altered its views and no longer desired to associate itself with France against China. Marshall, therefore, received with coldness the overtures of France and simply sought to let the matter drop discreetly.

But when, at the beginning of May, it was discovered that England had sent out a circular proposing to the Powers to regard the Japanese treaties as *permanent*, Marshall attempted to persuade France to reject that proposal, not because of any joint interests with Japan against China, but on the merits of the case itself. Nothing more was said about China, excepting as a separate subject and only with reference to the chances of war or peace between China and France. The revision was discussed on its own bearings alone, but it is of course possible that France was somewhat influenced by the new sentiment that circumstances might arise under which she would need, perhaps, the good will of Japan.

On 20 June the French Foreign Office accepted Marshall's programme, and, after arranging with the Office that the French answer to the English Circular should be drawn up in conformity with that programme. Marshall left Paris on 23 June for Brussels. When the text of the French Note came into his hands there on 10 July, he was disappointed to see that it did not correspond to the programme. But, about the same time, he learned two other things which made him attach less importance to the omissions of the French Note; the first, that the motives of France in proclaiming the *principle* of terminability were regarded with some mistrust by other Governments, in consequence of the suspicion that her action in the matter had been brought about by other considerations than those connected with the question in itself; the second, that both Germany and Belgium were disposed to go further in the sense of terminability and revision than France had done and that the example set by France was already surpassed.

From that moment the action of France lost

up the principle of permanence so strongly advocated by England.

As time passed on (during the months of July and August) it became more and more evident that, though every one was astonished that France had published the principle of terminability, no one attached any importance to the form in which she suggested that principle, first, because the other proposals which followed it were far more precise, secondly because every one recognised that the question of form could not be practically dealt with until all the Powers had accepted the principle.

These were the impressions which had been collected, in different directions, by Marshall, when, at the beginning of September, telegrams arrived from Tokio expressing dissatisfaction with the French Note and urging that efforts should be made to induce France to change the terms of that Note.

Now, even if France could be led to alter her language and to advocate a specific plan more in harmony with the wishes of Japan, it cannot be supposed that the adoption of such a plan by France

much of its use, for the double reason that other Governments had declared themselves ready to do more than France had suggested, and that the example and influence of those other Governments were likely to be far more powerful in Europe than those of France, because, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the opinion of France in the matter was evidently regarded as having but little moral weight.

Still it was manifest, in spite of all this, that the action of France, no matter what its hidden motives may be supposed to be, had largely served the cause of Japan. France had done two things which nobody had expected from her; she had suddenly abandoned her long existing attitude of indifference towards Japan, and she had taken the initiative in proclaiming that the Japanese treaties ought to be made terminable.

All the diplomatists consulted by Marshall expressed surprise at this change of tone and all of them made the observation that it was a great result to have led France to take the lead in giving

would really influence other European Governments. Its effect would probably be, in the present state of European opinion, to awaken a general suspicion that Japan had made some secret arrangement with France on the subject of China and that the new plan was an element of that arrangement, a price paid by France for services to be rendered to her by Japan. Such a suspicion would be damaging to Japan.

But there is no probability that France could be led to put forward any new plan at present, for she has no motive for doing so. France will, of course, accept the plan of terminability which Europe may adopt ultimately, but that is a very different thing from changing her own note. She cannot fail to be aware that she has nothing to hope from Japan, in the matter of China, beyond superficial good will in details, and that, consequently, she would obtain no advantage for herself by urging Europe to grant definitive terminability to Japan. It must also be borne in mind that it would be contrary to diplomatic usage to alter the pro-

posals of a Note while that Note is under consideration by the Government to which it is addressed. Furthermore, it was difficult enough to lead the French Foreign Office as far as it has gone already; many times, during the negotiation, all hope seemed to have disappeared; success was won, at last, through private and personal influences, in contradiction to the previous policy of the Office and notwithstanding the resolute opposition of certain important functionaries. That opposition still exists; it was its action, after Marshall had left Paris for Brussels, which brought about the change in the promised wording of the French Note; it was distinctly understood that that Note should be a reproduction of the programme, but when Marshall was no longer present the sense was altered and diminished; the opposition which achieved that result would instantly set to work again if the question were reopened.

Consequently, Marshall argues that it would be impolitic to ask more of France for the moment, and he repeats his reasons, as follows:

alone, but must be the outcome of an agreement between all the Powers.

7. Because the answers of many Continental Powers are not yet known to us, because the decision of England is still entirely uncertain, because the interest of Japan is to get all the Governments who accepted the *principle* of terminability to join together against England in the event of her continuing to refuse it, and because, with that contingency in view, it would be impolitic to press separate action on any one Power, especially on France.

8. Finally, because it would be contrary to precedent and usage to change the terms of a Note while it is under consideration—unless, indeed, some very special motive existed for doing so.

P. S. After the foregoing was written Marshall learnt from Baron Lambertmont that the French Minister for Foreign Affairs does not approve the Note which he sent to England, that he considers it insufficient, and that it is not impossible he may

1. Because it would be hardly possible to persuade France to modify her proposal now.

2. Because it would be dangerous to recommence a discussion which was carried to its present result through so many difficulties.

3. Because the French proposal, insufficient though it be, had admirably served the purpose of Japan, in Europe, and has done all that was really wanted from it, in setting an example in proclaiming a principle, and in publicly engaging the action of France in a direction absolutely contrary to that which she had previously followed.

4. Because the German and Belgian plans are, in reality, in consequence of their greater precision, the only ones which are under the consideration of Europe.

5. Because France is already viewed with suspicion in the matter, and because, the more she defends Japan the stronger will that suspicion become.

6. Because the form of terminability to be ultimately adopted by Europe for proposal to Japan, cannot be decided by France or by any other Power

adopt the Belgian plan instead of it. This being so it becomes even more undesirable (if possible) than it was already to press France to alter the Note. It may be, according to this information, that she will drop the Note altogether of her own accord and adopt the Belgian Note in its stead. And, in any case, it will be, for the present at all events, and for the reasons previously given wiser, more convenient and more advantageous for Japan to leave Belgium to urge France to adopt the Belgian Note than to take any immediate action in the matter ourselves.

三〇二 明治三十二年九月十九日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

佛政府ノ對英回答修正方ノ件

附屬書 十六年九月十五日發蜂須賀公使來電 (佛政府ノ對英回答修正方ノ件)

特 機密信 十一月七日到

拜啓過ル十一日森青木兩公使ト會合談話ノ結末過ル十三日 佛郵便ニハ執筆ノ暇無ク爰ニ其大略申述候 過ル十日當ヘリニコセルヘ青木公使到着森公使ハ其前八日

ニ着則翌十一日迄會談致候其節小生ガ兩公使ト談話ノ要點ハ則八月三十日附并ニ九月三日附兩度ノ貴電報ニテ小生ヘ御訓令有之候佛政府ガ英政府ニ對スル回答中行政規則ノケ條ヲ掲ゲザル事并ニ定期結約ノ年限ヲ掲ゲザル事等ニ付修正ヲ請求スル點ニ有之種々談論ヲ盡シ候得共何分現今ハ佛政府ニ對シ修正ヲ請求スル好機會トハ存シ難ク其理由ハ過ル十三日附佛便ニテ呈書ノ節差出候マルシヤル執筆ノ報告書ニ相盡有之通ニ御座候乍去小生マルシヤル共今十日程ニハ歸巴ノ覺悟ニ有之候間其以上機會ヲ見合セ程能キ都合有之候節ハ直接或ハ間接ノ手段ヲ以可成丈御訓令ノ如ク相運候様心懸ケ可申候

然ルニ即今一大問題ハ過ル十五日附ヲ以差出候小生電信上詳悉有之候通り稅則并ニ貿易ニ係ル規則而已ニ終期年限ヲ定メ此問題ハ日本政府ニ於テ向後其終期ニ至リ改正ノ全權ヲ持スル事トシ他ノ問題ニ拘ハズ即今改正ヲ行フ事本邦政府ノ御企望ニ可有之哉或ハ獨白政府ノ發議スル如ク條約全體ニ終期年限ヲ八年或ハ十年ト定メ此終期ハ其期ニ至リ各國政府ニ於テ日本ノ法律全體ヲ甘受シ而シテ日本全國ヲ開ク事ト共ニ行ヒ度萬一其期ニ至リ日本ニ於テ此コンデシ

曲御返答可相成候得共決シテ一部分ト言フ意味ニ無之日本全國ヲ開クト共ニ治外法權ヲ全廢スルノ獨政府意見ナル事ハ小生ニ於テモ髓ニ承知致シ居候事故一應此段申述置候右條々申進度他ハ後便ニ相讓候也

十六年九月十九日

蜂須賀茂韶

井上外務卿殿

内 展

註 1 附屬書參看

2 二九六文書

附屬書

十六年九月十五日發蜂須賀公使來電

(佛政府ノ對英回答修正方ノ件)

Envoyé de Belgique le 15 Septembre  
1883 par la Russie.

Gaimukio,

Please instruct me whether you are disposed to accept termination for the entire treaty on condition of opening the country and administering acceptable justice to foreigners as proposed by Germany and Belgium or whether you desire uncondi-

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇三

ヨンニ達セザルト各國ニ於テ見認ル時ハ止ヲ得ズ猶終期ヲ延引スル事而シテ稅則其他通商ニ係ルコンヴェンションハ即今一日モ速ニ執行スベシトノ意見ハ今日日本政府ノ甘受スル御評議ニ可有之哉此兩策孰レヲ是ト御認定可有之哉小生ノ心得迄ニ御訓令ヲ乞ヒ候事ニ御座候

未ダ今日迄此御返電領受不致候得共日夜相待居申候事ニ御座候七月十四日附ノ貴機密信中ニモ「佛國政府ノ意見ノ如ク一般ノ條約裁判稅則ヲ併セテ有期ノケ條ヲ加ヘ改正ヲ遂ゲ候ハ素ヨリ我政府ノ希望スル所ニ有之候得共各政府ニ於テモ或ハ之ヲ至難ト爲シ候哉ト過慮致候間先以通商條約ノミヘ期限ヲ附シ實施候様致度」トノ御考慮ニ有之果シテ此一般條約ニ有期ヲ附スル事前述ノ如キコンデシヨン付キノ有期ニ候得ハ決シテ至難ニ無之歐洲大陸各國中多クハ同意相成ルベキ即今ノ景況ニ有之候猶兩三日中ニハ御返電領受致候事ト存候ニ付次便猶又委曲可申述候七月十四日附貴機密信ニ御添付被下候貴君ヨリ森青木兩公使ヘノ貴機密信寫拜見小官大ニ心得ト相成奉謝候右青木公使ヘノ貴機密信中獨政府ノ意嚮治外法權ヲ全廢スルノ意味歟或ハ一部分ヲ廢スルノ意味ナル歟トノ御不審ニ相見ヘ右ハ青木氏ヨリモ委

tional termination for tariff and Commercial questions alone if it can be obtained treating the rest separately. The latter plan may fit your purpose, but it may be more difficult to obtain than the former, because the majority of the Continental Governments are inclined to adopt the former plan. I think also that the former plan would be more favorable and more dignified for Japan, since it would give us commercial convention at once and conditional termination hereafter for the whole treaty. I ask this question for my personal information and shall carry out in exact accord with Mori, Aoki instructions you may give me in reply.

Hachisuka.

三〇三 明治十三年九月二十八日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

條件附有期結約問題ニ關スル件

附屬書一

十六年九月十九日蜂須賀森青木公使宛電信  
(條約有効期間ニ關スル件)

- 二 十六年九月二十二日森蜂須賀兩公使發電
- 三 十六年九月十六日蜂須賀公使白國外務大輔

九六九

對話書

十一月十四日到

本月十九日附特別機密信ヲ以呈出致シ候已來小生ヨリ御訓令ヲ乞候改正一條兩策ニ對シタル御返電ハ未ダ落手不致候得共森青木小生三人へ當テタル

貴電信去ル二十一日落手其節ハ當地近在スパーへ森氏同道罷越居早速打寄拜見致候事ニ御座候青木氏へハ即日寫相送候事ニ御座候右貴電信中在日本獨逸公使ノ申出ニ御返答ノ趣キ以通商條約稅則共八年ノ期限ヲ以コンデシヨニ拘ラズ確然終期ヲ見認メ法權其他ノ問題ニ關係ナク速ニ條約ヲ結フノ本邦政府御意見ナル事ハ判然拜承飽迄モ其御趣意ヲ遵奉可致ハ申迄モ無之次第ニ御座候

且又

貴官ヨリ獨逸公使へ御返答ニ可相成三ヶ條ノ御意見是又委曲敬承森氏ニモ委曲承知ニテ去ル二十三日歸龍相成申候改正一條ニ付テハ過日森始三人會合以來別シテ何事モ打合セ協力致候等ニ相談致シ居ル事ニテ御訓令ニ遵ヒ追々相運ヒ可申候然レ處過日森氏滯留中種々相談ノ上通商條約稅則ハ他ノ問題ニ拘ラズ確乎定期結約相成ハ申迄モ無之候得共法

(條約ノ有效期限ニ關スル件)

From Inouye to Hachisuka,  
Mori and Aoki at Paris.

September 19, 1883.

I had long interview with German Minister, the following are the main points of conversation; he said, that do you know the England circular? I answered, I only know the principal points. He said that, he has received private instruction from Bismarck to assure you of the intention of German Government to do for you as much as they can, they would consent to separate settlement of the commercial part. I thank German Government, but how is the other part? German Minister: that will be discussed and settled hereafter. I: how is the termination of the commercial part? German Minister: 8 years as proposed by protocol but upon condition that if, during that period, you could be prepared to open the whole country, then you may denounce the whole treaty, if not another treaty revision must be had, but I am instructed at the same time to ask you privately what concessions

權ノ問題ハ獨白政府ノ發議ノ如クコンデシヨニ付ノ定期結約ヲ本邦政府ニ於テハ御甘受可相成旨佛獨白等在日本公使へ御申入有之度段森小生連名ニテ意見ヲ電呈致候事ニ御座候其故ハ即今歐洲大陸各國政府ノ意嚮此點則チ法權其他ノ問題ニ付コンデシヨニ付ノ定期結約ヲナス各國ノ好意ヲ御甘受相成候方事成就シ易ク可有之相考候事ニ御座候此趣意宜御汲察御高慮有之度希望ニ不堪候

一昨廿六日當白國外務大輔ランベルモン氏ト小生ガ談話書別紙進呈致候是ハ極機密ト申事同氏吳々被申居候事ニ付其御含ニテ御承知ノ程希望致候森公使へハ今日別紙進呈ノ談話書寫參考ノ爲メ相送り申候  
右要件而已早々如此御座候也

十六年九月廿八日

茂 詔

敬 白

外務卿閣下

註 1 前掲三〇二文書

2 及 3 夫々附屬書一及二

附屬書一

十六年九月十九日附錄須賀森青木三公使宛往電

you are ready to make? I replied, the question is very serious to prelude my giving any immediate answer but would like to know what is the opinion of German Government on this point? He replied, the extended system of passport by which foreign merchants are enabled to trade in the interior directly with producers. I said, that will immediately bring up the question of jurisdiction and involve our government in endless complications. He asked, what I think of coasting trade claimed by English circular. I replied, the geographical position of Japan entirely forbids us to grant this privilege to foreigner. He said, in his own opinion, we could open two or three ports and so extend the present system of foreign ships going between the open ports. I asked the opinion of German Government regarding the most favoured nation clause. He replied to settle it in accordance with German China Treaty of 1861.

I propose to answer:

1. With reference to extension of passport system, as it will necessarily involve jurisdiction ques-

十六年九月二十二日森峰須賀兩公使發電

Envoyé de Spa le 22 Septembre 1883.

Gainukio, Tokio.

tion, it would be better to postpone its discussion and settlement jurisdiction question is taken up in this way (*the settlement of jurisdiction question taken up in this way (?)*). I wish to detach this claim for concession from commercial question.

2. If they will consent to increase of tariff and termination clause definitely even for 10 years or more we will consent to concede coasting-trade for 5 years in accordance with the principle contained in the protocol, that is, under the system of Japanese chartering foreign vessels.

3. As to the most favoured nation clause, although German Minister says to fix it in accordance with German China Treaty of 1881, as I find it very vague, propose to ask to make it a definite conditional clause and to maintain the form we have proposed in the conference.

Just received Hachisuka's telegram of 17 from St. Petersburg. Will answer it to-morrow, but bear also this telegram in mind in carrying out the work.

## 附屬書II

三〇三

問ニ參リタリ先達テヨリ條約改正ノ儀ニ付追々「マルシマル」氏へ内密厚意ノ御談話被成下シ事ヲ多謝ス改正ニ係ル各政府ノ意嚮等日本政府へ内密ニ報告致置タレトモ未タ確然詳細ノ内訓ヲ得サルナリ尙今後モ不相變閣下ノ厚意ヲ希望近時猶御聞込ノ事御内話降サル、ニ於テハ幸甚ノ至ナランベルモン氏曰ク

改正一條既ニ「マルシマル」氏迄内話シ置タル事柄ハ閣下ニモ御熟知相成リシ事ト思考ス

抑改正一條ニ付テハ白政府ニ於テハ英政府ノ發議ニ對スル白政府ノ覺書寫ヲ歐洲各政府ニ送り且ツ内密ノ書翰ヲ送り以テ各國ノ同意ヲ促カシ遂ニ歐洲過半白國ノ覺書ニ同意ヲ表スルニ至リシ是迄モ歐洲政府ノ日本ニ對スル厚意ハ存在シ居リシト雖トモ狐疑シテ顯ハレザリシガ白政府ハ眞ノ戰爭ヲ爲シ(*faisant la Compagne*)斷然和好ノ意嚮ニ導キタルヲ欣賀ス乍併英國政府ハ如何ナル方向ニ決スベキヤ未ダ確知スル能ハス閣下モ御承知ニ候半英外務省ノ *Paunssfort* 氏及ヒ *Parke* 氏等ハ讓與調和ニ同意スルノ色ナシ(*concession, transaction*)元來讓與和好ヲ欲セサルハ東洋ニ久シク住居セシ政事家ノ常僻ナリ在英白國公使ハ小生ノ

We shall find much facility for our action in

Europe if you confidentially inform German and French Ministers to Japan that highly appreciating sympathy and friendly action of their governments to Japan, you will consent to conditional termination clause for the settlement of jurisdiction question with clear understanding that new commercial treaty with unconditional termination clause shall immediately concluded independently of all other questions. If you can communicate the same to Belgian Minister to Japan, we shall be very glad.

Mori, Hachisuka.

## 附屬書III

十六年九月二十六日蜂須賀公使白國外務大輔對話書

九月廿六日小官ト白國外務大輔ランベルモン氏ト談話

ノ覺書

小官曰ク

先日來「スパ」へ差越居リ昨夜當府へ到着ニ付早速御尋

友人ニモ有之日本へ對シ英政府モ好意ヲ表スベキ様ニ勸告盡力スベキ旨ヲ内訓シ置キタル處此頃同公使ヨリ此手紙ヲ送リタリ至極内密ノ書翰故其御心得ニテ御聽ヲ乞フト述ハ在英白國公使ノ書翰ヲ讀マレシ其大意左ノ如シ

日本條約改正ニ係ル英政府ノ書類ハ凡テ役所ノ引出中ニ藏メ未ダ研究ノ運ヒニ至ラス十一月ノ頃即チ新公使 *Punnett* 氏出發ノ時分ニ至リテ初メテ取調ヘニ着手スベキ模様ナリ *Parke* 氏ノ意見ニ全ク同ナル *Paunssfort* 氏擔任中ハ迎モ英政府カ日本ニ好意嚮ヲ表シ讓與ヲ爲スベキ望(*espoir*)非ラサリシ乍併相互讓與ノ語ハ(*le mot de transaction*)改正事件擔任ノ *Currie* 氏ヲ驚カサノルナリ白國政府ノ發議案ヲ相互讓與ノ基本トスル事ニ *Currie* 氏ヲ同意セシムルニハ全ク望無キニ非ス云々

而シテ又ランベルモン氏曰ク

先達テヨリマルシマル氏へ追々内話セシ事最モ機密ヲ要ス英政府ハ甚タ猜疑深キ故種々機密ノ談話拙者ヨリ出デシ事萬々一相分り候テハ甚タ困却ニ付惣テ貴政府ニ於テモ嚴ク内密ニ成サル、様閣下ヨリ御申遣降サレタシ

小官曰ク



拙者并ニマルシヤル氏へ御内話ノ件々ハ最モ秘密ノモノト  
信シクルニ付決テ洩泄致シ間鋪ク段々ノ御懇切多謝スル所  
ナリ

三〇四 明治十六年十月五日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

佛政府ノ對英回答ニ關スル「マルシヤル」氏ノ對話  
書送付ノ件

附屬書 十六年十月三日マルシヤル氏ト佛外務省通商  
局長トノ對話書

機 第六拾四號

佛政府ヨリ英ニ對スル回答書ニ關シ御來電ノ趣有之即去月  
十二日附ヲ以テブリュッセル府ヨリ答電佛政府ヘ右回答修  
正ノ儀ハ即今請求難致旨及申陳置候然處右ハマルシヤル氏  
通商局長ト當六月内約ノ趣旨モ有之候ニ付今般歸巴ノ上則  
同氏ヲ外務省ヘ差遣シ行政上ノ件々ヲ揭記セシ并定期締約  
ノ事ヲ明記セサリシ理由ニ關シ同局長ヨリ其説明ヲ請求爲  
致候

右談話書英文及御送付候尙本件ニ付テハ通商局長ノ勸告モ

weeks afterwards, I had the disappointment of seeing that it did not realise the conditions of the programme; the principle of terminability was not laid down with the clearness you had authorised me to hope for and administrative questions were not mentioned at all. The result was that the expectations which I had expressed to Mr. Hachisuka and which he had at once telegraphed to Tokio were not fully realised and that he and I seemed to the Japanese Government to have overrated the good dispositions of France. We were placed, therefore, in a false position, and I must begin to-day by pointing out to you that I have, personally, reason to complain that your promises were not more completely fulfilled.

Clavery. I am sorry you think you have had cause to be dissatisfied and I quite understand your view. But let me tell you that when we set ourselves to write, after you had left Paris, we found that it was not possible to adopt exactly, in our Note to England, the programme you had brought to us. As regards administrative questions we were

有之候ニ付修好局長ビヨール氏ヘモ不日マルシヤル氏ヲ以テ  
談話爲致候心得ニ有之此段及開陳候也

明治十六年十月五日

駐佛特命全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

外務卿井上馨殿

註 一三〇一附屬書三來電

附屬書

十六年十月三日マルシヤル氏ト佛國外務省通商局長トノ  
對話書

Paris, 3 October 1883.

Conversation between Marshall and  
Mr. Clavery, Commercial Director at  
the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Marshall. When we parted, at the end of June, it was agreed that the French answer to the English Circular should be based on the programme which I had presented to you and which, you informed me, the French Government had accepted. But when the ext of your Note came into my hands, three

obliged to leave them out, after consideration, because we found we could not distinguish them, in general terms, from judicial questions. And as regards terminability we adopted the language which seemed to be the best calculated to give reasonable satisfaction to Japan, on the one side, and to avoid irritating England, on the other. Furthermore, you are well aware that the Commercial Department was, throughout the negotiations with you in May and June, less favorably disposed towards your programme than the Political Department was, and as the Commercial Department has the immediate control of the Japanese revision, my colleagues in it insisted that they ought to be heard. I need not tell you that I, individually, took the same view as the Political Department, but I had opposition all round me in my own office and I could not do more, at the time, than I did. Again, remember that we were the first to move; when our Note was sent to London we were ignorant of the views of all the Governments except England, who was strongly against terminability, and we proceeded,

naturally, with some hesitation in a direction which was then so new and in which we supposed we might be advocating alone, in opposition to England. Now that other Governments have adopted similar views and have expressed them in words which go beyond those we employed, we may, perhaps, be disposed to do more when an opportunity offers. But I have given little thought to the matter since our Note was despatched; I have been too much occupied with other things and I have been away. I have read the German and Belgian Notes, and, as the Belgian Note is much clearer than the German Note, it has seemed to me that if we decided to adopt either of them we should, for that reason, lean rather to the Belgian Note, but I have in no way considered yet what the further action of France should be. I do not see, indeed, how we could examine that until we know the reply which England may make to the different Notes which have been communicated to her, and until we perceive distinctly the dispositions of England. Do you know what the Japanese Government thinks of the

the rest of the proposals contained in the German and Belgian Notes I am unable to say anything, because I know nothing as to the opinions which may exist in Japan. What is your idea as to rendering the commercial terminability definitive.

Clavery. I cannot answer that without reflection, without talking to my colleagues, without consulting the Minister, and, probably, without hearing what the other Powers might think about it. All I can tell you now is that I quite understand that Japan should wish for the arrangement you speak of; but, whether we should be disposed to grant it or to refuse it I cannot at all say. And I must repeat that, even if we had an opinion, we could not take any further public action until England has made known her views.

Marshall. As the Continental Powers seem to be almost unanimous in adopting the principle of total ultimate terminability, I hope they will join together to press England to accept it too.

Clavery. I am surprised at the favorable dispositions manifested. The information in our hands when you went away in June in no way indicated

different Notes?

Marshall. Time has not sufficed to allow instructions to arrive, but the representatives of Japan in Europe incline to the impression that the Government will desire, probably, to maintain the division which was claimed at the Tokio Conference between the terminability of the commercial parts of the treaty and terminability of all the other parts, the former being independent of the latter and being rendered definitive at a fixed date. Now, thus far, France is the only country which, in its Note, has separated the terminability into two parts, according to the programme I gave you. It is therefore possible that instructions may be sent to Mr. Hachisuka to ask France to urge the other Powers to accept the separation which you have so made, instead of mixing of the terminability of the whole treaty together as seems to be done in the German and Belgian Notes, and also, to add to your present proposal of separate terminability for the commercial part the further condition that the terminability shall be definitive at a fixed date. As regards

the probability that Japan would be treated so generously, and our feeling, in sending our Note to London, was that we were setting an example which was not likely to be generally followed. However, all that is changed now, and I am very glad that your prospects have become so good. I need not tell you that we shall do all we can for you here, only you must continue to get the Political Department to support you. Do not press us to go too fast; we must wait for others. I will take up the subject again and will examine the idea of separate terminability for the commercial parts of the treaty. But what do you mean, exactly, by "the commercial parts of the treaty"?

Marshall. I presume that they would include the tariff and such commercial questions as were discussed and practically settled at the Tokio Conference.

Clavery. Nothing else?

Marshall. Nothing else, so far as I personally suppose. But remember that I am speaking privately, without instructions or authority, and that I merely express my own impressions. I will let you

know as soon as I can speak with more certainty.

三〇五 明治十六年十月十一日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

### 條件附有期結約問題ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十六年九月二十日附井上外務卿ヨリ蜂須賀

青木森公使宛往電

二 十六年九月十七日發青木公使ヨリ外務卿宛

電信寫

(最惠國條款及終期約款ニツイテノ獨逸政府意向ニ關スル件)

三 十六年九月三十日發青木公使ヨリ外務卿宛

電信寫

四 十六年九月三十日青木公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使

宛內信

五 十六年十月六日蜂須賀公使ヨリ青木公使宛

內信

六 十六年十月十日蜂須賀公使ヨリ淺野公使宛

內信

七 十六年十月三日附淺野公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使

宛內信

拜啓諸ハ條約改正事件ニ付先月廿三日落手致候森青木小生

伊國ニ於テモ淺野氏同國外務卿ト改正事件ニ付談話有之候趣是ハ同氏并ニ青木氏ヨリ委曲可申進候ニ付爰ニ略致シ候尤此談話書中ニモ佛政府ニ於テ英政府同様我カ希望ニ違反スル意味相見ヘ候ニ付別紙戌號寫ノ通淺野氏ヘ紙面昨十日差出置申候淺野氏ヨリ到來ノ書翰ハ已號寫ノ通ニ御座候右逐條御參考ニ供シ度早々如此御座候也

十六年十月十一日

茂 詔

### 外務卿閣下

猶々去ル八日森公使英外務卿別業ヘ一泊相越改正事件ニ付通商條約稅則ニ明確ナル終期ヲ付スル事ヲ希望スル云々其他談話有之候由未タ右談話書寫ハ廻シ來ラズ候ニ付委曲ハ承知不致候得共通知ノ儘一應申進候

諸日本駐劄英國新公使ブランケット氏昨十日當公使館ヘ尋問シ小生面會致候節何事モ龍動ニ於テ森氏ヨリ談話可致候得共一應右ロッド、グランヴィル森氏ト談話有之候顛末相話置候旨申入候處<sup>●</sup>ブランケット氏ノ中ニハ同氏當夏來在佛英大使ロッド、ライラン氏ノ留守中代理致シ居頗ル多用本邦條約ノ事ニ付テハ何ノ點モ未ダ研究不致且

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇五

三人ハ當テタル貴電信ノ義森并ニ小生ニ於テ總テ承知不致ケ條ニ付早速青木氏ヘ通知致シ同氏ヨリ貴君ヘ既ニ差出候電信有之右ニ對シタル貴電信ニ候得ハ右青木電信寫差送候様照會致候處先月三十日附ヲ以別紙甲乙號貴君ヘ同氏ヨリ呈シ候二度ノ電信寫送リ來別紙丙號同氏ヨリ小生ヘノ書翰ト共ニ落手致候然處兼テ貴君御手許ヘ差出置候獨政府回章マルシヤル探知ノ實ト青木氏電信ノ趣ト齟齬ノ廉有之且佛政府不好意思ノ如ク青木氏ヨリ申候ハ事實ト相違致シ彼是不明瞭免レ難ク候ニ付別紙丁號ノ通小生ヨリ青木氏ヘ書翰差出置候右返翰ハ未ダ落手不致候得共一兩日ニハ必到來可致相待居申候何分本邦ノ爲メ各處區々ノ取扱相成候テハ不宜相考如此取計候段宜御承知被下度候

諸又通商條約稅則ニ明確ノ終期ヲ付シ速ニ實行相成候様本邦政府ノ御企望東京豫議會ノ節ヨリ今日ニ至リ決テ不相變事ト拜察致候得共其他條約全體ニ關スル獨白政府ノ發議セシ如キコンデシヨシ付キノ終期ニ於テハ即今不邦政府ニ於テ御甘受可相成哉或ハ後日ニ讓ルノ御決意ニ候哉先月十五日附小生ヨリ呈シ候電信并同廿二日附森小生兩人ヨリ呈シ候電信ニ對シ御電令日夜相待居申候

龍動ヘ來ル十三日出發相越英外務省ノ意嚮ヲ承リ候迄ハ同人一己ノ説トテモ今日相話シ難キ旨返答有之候且本邦ヘハ同氏來年一月初旬リバブール發ノ郵船ニテ亞米利加通り相越候由相話申候此段モ御參考ノ爲メ申進候也

註 1 本號附屬書一參看

2 三〇二附屬書

3 三〇三附屬書二

尙別紙甲乙丙丁戊己號ハ夫々本號附屬書二、三、四、

五、六、七ナリ

### 附屬書一

十六年九月二十日附井上外務卿ヨリ蜂須賀、青木、森三  
公使宛往電

From Inouye to Hachisuka, Aoki  
and Mori in Paris.

September 20, 1883.

The principal part of Aoki's telegram read: they propose for the present, besides tariff, new wording, of the favoured nation clause and concession in the administrative powers, also termination of tariff, subject to further agreement.

Is favoured nation clause absolutely conditional? If it is like that of German China treaty of 1881,

九七九

it is too vague. Is any concession in the administrative powers to be made at the same time with tariff, and to what extent? The favoured nation clause, concession of administrative powers, and termination of tariff; are they conditional with opening of country? If so, suppose we can not be ready to open country in time fixed, then is tariff to be revised or to be made same rate as in the existing treaty and does favoured nation clause still continue in its conditional character or revert to present conditional? Reply by telegraph.

支那の税関

出 發 十六年九月三十日附青木公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛電信寫  
(最惠條款及終期約款ニシテハ獨逸政府意見ニ關スル件)

From Aoki to Inouye.

With reference to my despatch of 21 June and in conformity with your telegraphic message of 29 August, I send full particulars. German proposition to foreign Powers contemplates securing all possible concessions to us for the present and the possibility of obtaining the rest afterwards. They propose for the present besides tariff new wording of the

despatch Siebold to carry information and memorandum to Asano and to make use of Siebold's connections with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs there.

Regarding my visit to Vienna, I must add for your personal information only that in consequence of the illness of Wooyeno I seized favorable opportunity to ask Minister for Foreign Affairs that Austrian influence be exercised in Paris and elsewhere in accordance with German propositions. He distinctly promised this. I might perhaps also exercise some influence on opinion.

September 17 1883.

支那の税関

入 讀 十六年九月三十日附青木公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛電信寫

To Inouye from Aoki.

Before German Government issued their circular, I repeatedly recommended here to have fulfilled your desires all, especially on three points mentioned in your telegram of 19 September, and, although the first seems to meet your wish, the success of intermediation, as to the third especially the second,

favoured nation clause and concessions in the administrative powers, also the termination of tariff subject to further agreement. As to the opening of the country, whether the opening is under an entire or partial abolishment of extraterritorial jurisdiction or whether the opening means entire opening and enjoyment of all rights in the interior or mere travelling for commercial pursuits is left an open question. We are free to propose what we think proper and when we think proper. Our case is not in any way prejudiced and all depends on our employing well our time and opportunities. With the present determination of England and France, any attempt at settling now the mode and principle of opening could only produce disadvantages to our interests, whilst by leaving the question for the present you may be assured that you will hold the conditions of opening in your own hands and, without doubt, with the further good-will and assistance of Germany, these conditions will meet eventually quite the wishes of our government. In consequence of a harmonious consultation at Brussels, I

was doubted without finding shifts. They, therefore, proposed to adopt the German Chinese Convention of 1881, and to grant us the right of denunciation, conditional, that is, the effective exercise of this right should be dependent upon the opening of the country under condition acceptable to Powers. Respecting your last telegram, I repeat, Germany recommends to others acceptance of increasing tariff, the concession in administrative power and the new wording of favoured nation clause, above all the grant of right of denunciation according to the aforesaid *modus vivendi*. As to German intention relative to terminability, I am sure that it refers not only to tariff but to all treaties. They will kindly effectuate in favour of Japan the recognition of this principle in genera and some concession in administrative powers, which you shall obtain in the occasion of next conference as Jappe would tell you about it within fortnight, and also the new wording of favoured nation clause, not conditional with opening of the country. Besides, it is very inopportune to re-

monstrate now against German proposals which seem to be even not easily acceptable to England and France. Your last resort to stick to existing treaties may be eventually good, but wait for the result of German endeavour. I have a good hope in the coalition of Germany, Austria, Belgium and Italy, where Assano is now working under assistance of Siebold and Count Fe.

Berlin, the 30/9 1883.

## 附屬書四

丙號 十六年九月三十日附青木公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使宛内信  
昨日御發ノ電信落手仕候實ハ不待本日業ニ已ニ拙答可差出  
答ノ處在封甲號電信ノ意味於不邦誤解相成候末本月廿日井  
上外務卿ヨリ至極「エキサイト」シタル電信到ルニ付此方  
ヨリ答詞差遣候ニハ是非ニ獨政府回文ノ原書ヲ一見シ某々  
條項ニ關スル該政府ノ意嚮(小生ハ固ヨリ大體ノ意味ノ  
ミ口頭ヲ以通知シ別ニ公書ヲ以テ照會不致候)明確ニ可申  
遣存シ爲之索遡上公殿下ノ厚庇ヲ假リ東西ニ奔走致シ候得  
共終ニ不遂不意候都合ニテ有之申候就テハ盟臺ハ可差出拙  
答日一日遷延ニ相成恐縮ニ候尤獨政府回章ノ意嚮ハ「マル

sion of the coasting trade in accordance with our proposal contained in protocol ニテ取付ケ別ニ我ニ不利ナル「コンデション」(即開國ノ規約等)ヲ「アクセプト」致ス間敷トノ趣意ニ相見候處此點ハ實ニ難被行請求ニ相見ヘ申候  
(以下不要ノ件ニ付略之)

十六年九月三十日

青 木

## 蜂須賀閣下

註 1「是ハ小生ヨリ貴君ヘ呈シ候電信ヲ指スナリ」ト蜂須賀公使ノ朱書アリ 三〇二附屬書參照  
2「此青木氏ノ考慮ハ小生ニ於テ至極尤ニ考申候蜂須賀拜井上君閣下」ト朱書アリ

## 附屬書五

丁號 十六年十月六日附蜂須賀公使ヨリ青木公使宛内信  
去月三十日附貴書中ニハ獨政府回章ノ意嚮ハ「マルシヤル氏探知ノ實ニ相違無之」トノ御申越ニ候得共十七日附ノ貴電信中ヲ見レバ(別紙貴電信寫ニ——ノ印ヲ付置候通)通商條約稅則ニハ別段ノ終期ヲ獨政府發議セシ如ク相見ヘ「マルシヤル」氏探知ノ實」ト相違致候マルシヤル氏ヨリ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇八

シヤル」探知ノ實ニ相違無之亦小生ノ聞知スル所モ有之候間別紙乙號以不日不邦ヘ電信イタシ申候右ニテ老臺ヘ可答拙生ノ勘考モ明了ニ相成或ハ相見ヘ可申候間敷同ノ御投書ニ對シ一々不呈拙答候併シ最緊要ノ件ハ不厭重復左ニ啓上候

1「本月十五日附貴電信ノ御問合ケ條ハ老臺能ク之ヲ爲セリ事實ニ於テ相違無之候(是ハ小生ヨリ貴君ヘ呈シ候電信ヲ指スナリ)

一、本月廿二日附不邦ヘ御差出ノ電信ニ付テハ聊異存無之ニモ非ズ併シ小生ノ不同意云々ヲ別ニ井上氏ヘ申遣ス覺悟ニ無之候將又異存ノ康ハ

目下「セツトル」スベキ箇條ハ通商條約就中稅則其他行政權ノ回復及 New wording of the most favoured nation clause 并ニ recognition of the right of denunciation for Japan ニテ有之候間吾儕周旋ノ際 jurisdiction ニ關シテハ更ニ任國政府ト可商議都合ニ無之況ンヤ jurisdiction ニ關スル termination ニ於テオヤ本月十九日附外務卿電信末項第二點ノ意味ハ increasing tariff and its criminality ナ conce-

承知スル處ハ條約物體ヘ「コンデション」付キノ終期ヲ八年ト定メ其期ニ至リ「コンデション」未タ不充分ナル時ハ猶又延引スル事ト承知致シ此八年間不邦政府ニ於テハ勉強法律ノ改良ヲナシ其期限ニ至リ約束ノ通り歐洲政府ニ於テモ終期ヲ承諾スルニ至ラシムル事ニ有之先達テ貴君御手許ヘ差進候マルシヤル氏獨政府回章ノ報告書中ニモ分明致居候通決シテ別段ニ通商條約稅則ノ終期ヲ發議セシトハ承知不致候又開國ノ點ニ於テモ全國ヲ開ク歟或ハ國中ノ幾部分ヲ開クカ今日ニテハ不定ノ如ク貴電信中相見得候處マルシヤル氏ノ探知スル處ニ於テハ獨政府ハ全國ヲ開ク事ヲ意味スルニ相違無之此全國ヲ開キ治外法權ヲ解クト同時ニ條約ノ期限モ終ルモノト獨政府發議セシト承知致シ居是又貴電信ト「マルシヤル」探知ノ實ト相違ヲ相覺ヘ候

且又今一ケ條貴答ヲ煩候事ハ十七日附貴電信寫并ニ三十日附貴電信寫中ニモ——印ヲ付置候通<sup>2</sup>英ト佛トハ全く同様日本ニ抗議シ好意ヲ示サ、ルモノ、如ク御掲載有之是ハ小生ニ於テ甚意外ニ考ヘ候先達テ御手許ヘ差出置候佛ノ英ニ對スル回答寫中分明致居候通佛ハ英ノ無期條約ニ反對シ有期結約ノ主義ヲ發議シ日本ヘ好意相示シタルモノニ相違無之

又今便貴書中ニモ佛英共ニ抗議シ歡心相顯サズトノ貴意ニ相見得其爲メ貴君埃國ヘ御苦勞相成埃政府ヨリハ別シテ佛政府ヘ獨政府發議ノ如ク好意相示シ候様韓旋有之度段御申入相成候事ニ相見ヘ且一昨日伊國滯留シイボルト氏ヨリマルシヤルヘノ紙面ニ依レバ英佛共ニ抗議スル故伊國ニ於テ獨政府ニ同意ノ上ハ右兩國ニ勸告有之度段伊政府ヘ申入候様相聞ヘ實ニ意外ノ次第佛ニ於テハ前顯申入ル如ク獨白政府ノ如キ好意ニ比較スレバ或ハ厚薄アリ佛ハ獨白ヨリ薄キ哉モ難計候得共毫モ不厚意ノ點ハ無之此度歸巴ノ上マルシヤル氏ヲ當外務省通商局長ニ面話爲致候處此通商局長ノ談話ヲ承知致候テモ好意ハ十分相見得居申候此談話書ハ兩三日中淨寫ノ上送進可致候加之佛政府ノ發議ニハ通商條約稅則ノ終期ト他條約惣體ノ終期ト二段ニ區別シ有之是ハ日本政府東京豫議會ノ節ヨリ今日ニ到ル迄終始變セザル企望ト致承知候ニ付佛ノ回答ハ本邦ノ企望ニ此點ニ於テハ符合スルモノト相考ヘ（勿論佛政府ハ終期ノ主義而已ヲ掲ゲ明カニ年限ヲ今日定ムルトハ不申是ハ小生モ甚不充分ニ考居候）然ルニ貴君并ニ「シイボルト」ヨリ既ニ御勸告相成候通埃伊兩政府ニ於テ獨政府ノ發議ニ同意シ佛政府ヘ韓旋有

上不足ヲ申入候義ニテハ毛頭無之又埃伊政府等ヘ貴君并ニ「シイボルト」ヲ以テ御勸告相成候事ニ付小生ニ於テ儻キ甲斐ナシトテ不滿ヲ唱ルニモ決テ無之何處カラニテモ我本邦政府ノ意ニ適合スル様遵奉盡力シ好結果ヲ得ルコソ願ハシキ事ニ有之候得共本邦政府ノ爲メ御互ノ間ニ合點違ヒ有之候テハ萬々不宜此爲メ事矛盾ヲ生シ且他日混雜ヲ惹起シ候事ヲ相恐候ニ付忌諱ヲ不憚如此申進候

斯ク包藏ナク申入ルハ全ク小生ノ善意ヨリ申入候事ニテ一點ノ疑團無之段ハ宜ク御洞察被下猶貴君ヨリモ御腹臆ナク其實ヲ御吐露委曲御返答被下度希望ニ不堪奉存候兎角本邦政府ノ決意明白ニ承知致シ候様訓令ヲ得ル迄ハ御同然働キ甚致シ惡ク相考申候前段ニ對シテハ吳々モ明亮ノ貴報奉待候也

十六年十月六日

青木公使宛

蜂 須 賀

註 1及2前掲附屬書二及三下線ノ部分參看

附屬書六

戊號 十六年十月十日附蜂須賀公使ヨリ淺野公使宛內信

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇五

之時ハ或ハ日本ニ於テ希望スル如ク終期ヲ二段ニ區別スル佛政府ノ意ヲ留メ獨政府ノ發議スル區別ナキ條約全體ノ終期ニ同意セシムルヲ望ムニ相當リ或ハ後日混雜ヲ可生哉ト苦慮致候尤此小生ノ考ハ「マルシヤル」探知ノ實ヲ獨政府回章ノ主意ニ相違無之ト信シ候ヨリ起ルモノニシテ貴君ニ於テ別ニ御聞込ノ義有之此點ニ於テハマルシヤル探知セシ事ハ間違ナリ儘ニ獨政府ニ於テハ通商條約稅則ノ終期ヲ發議シ而シテ他條約全體ノ終期モ亦發議セシニ相違ナシトノ御返答相伺候得ハ小生ニ於テ安心可致候元來小生ニ於テハ先日會合ノ節御話合致候通り獨白政府ノ發議ヲシテ歐洲各國政府ニ同意セシメ英政府終ニ孤立シ難ク満足ノ結果ヲ得ル事コソ萬々希望致候得共如何ニセン日本政府ノ決意ハ今日ニ於テ通商條約稅則而已ヲ明カニ年限ヲ立ルノ考慮ト察セラレ而シテ獨白政府ノ發議スル條約全體コンデシヨ付ノ終期ノ事ハ他日ニ譲リ今日「アクセプト」セザル心算ナル哉トモ察セラレ是等ノ推察ヨリ小生先月十五日外務卿ヘ電信差出シ猶又森氏連名ニテ廿二日附電信相送候事ニ有之（此二信ニ對シ外務卿ヨリ未タ返答無之候）小生ニ於テハ小生任國政府ノ好意ヲ不好意ノ如ク貴君ヨリ伺候ニ付一身

本月三日附ノ貴書辱拜讀先月廿七日ニ那拿爾ヘ御出張改正一條ニ付伊國外務卿ヘ御談話書添ヘ御申越被下辱ク奉存候全ク御苦勞御盡力ニヨリ同政府ニ於テモ好意相示候段爲國御同慶此事ニ御座候

猶返翰御落手次第御示可被下旨忝奉待候  
 緒御談話書中佛政府ニ於テモ英政府同様我望意ニ違反シ好意相示サマル如キ御考慮ヨリ伊政府ニ於テ佛政府ヘモ獨政府ノ如ク日本ヘ好意ヲ示候様勸告有之度御申入相成候事ニ相見ヘ此義ハ小生ニ於テ甚意外ニ相考候元來先達テ御送致ニ及候佛政府ガ英政府ヘノ回答書中ニモ有之候通英ノ發議スル無期結約ニ反對シ有期結約ノ主義ヲ發議セシハ佛ノ厚意ニ有之今日ニ於テ佛ニ於テ不好意ノ點無之候然ルヲ他ノ政府ニ對シ佛ハ不好意ノ如ク御申入有之候テハ事矛盾ヲ生シ後日ノ混雜免レサル事ニ御座候小生一身上ニ取り不滿申入候譯ニハ決テ無之候得共本邦ノ爲メ御互間區々ニ取扱候テハ決テ不宜相考候間此邊ハ篤ト御注意被下度奉存候青木氏ヘモ此點ニ付兩三日前申入置有之且當館顧問格「マルシヤル」モ「シイボルト」氏迄委曲申入置候事ニ御座候宜敷御承知可被下候

猶當方ヨリモ追々改正事件ニ付テハ御打合可致先ハ至急右要件貴答迄如此御座候也

明治十六年十月十日

茂 詔

淺野公使宛

附屬書七

已號 十六年十月三日附淺野公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使宛内信

條約事件ニ付吾カ外務卿ヨリノ教令ニ依リ老臺及ヒ青木森兩公使白國ニ於テ被遂御面議候末在獨公使館付シ一ポルト氏當館ヘ派遣ニ相成即チ拙官ヘモ同様ナル電令有之候間同氏ヲ拙官ノ譯官トシテ先月廿七日那不見ヘ派シ當外務卿マシニ一氏ニ面會別紙ノ通及談判候條入貴覽候伊政府ニ於テハ全ク獨乙政府ノ所見ニ同意シ頗ル吾カ政府ノ爲メ好意ヲ盡サレ且我望意ニ違反シタル政府ヘハ厚ク周旋可致トノ義ニテ至極好都合ニ相運中候尙拙官ヨリ當外務卿ヘ書簡ヲ以テ申入置候間返翰到來次第尙又可供御内覽ト存候貴官ヨリモ御談判ノ御模様御垂示被下度冀入候也

十月三日

淺 野

事ニ御座候然ル處森青木小生三人ニ於テ協力ノ妨ケト相成候程ニハ無之候得共各持論ハ異リ申候ニ付貴君ノ御心裡ニ御含被下度爰ニ申上候

第一 森公使ノ說ハ左ノ通

英國政府ニ於テハ最初ヨリ何事ニ歟托シ條約重修ヲ延引スヘキノ意嚮ニ有之此度獨白政府ノ發議スル條約全體コンデシヨシ付キノ終期ノ如キハ英ニ於テ決シテ同意スヘカラサルノミナラス之ヲ幸ナル口實トシテ通商條約ノ締結ヲモ之ト共ニ引キ延ハシ終ニ即今條約中一ノ重修モ爲シ得ヘカラルニ至ラシムヘク元來獨政府發議ノ如キ表ハ日本ニ對シ好意ヲ示スカ如クシテ其實條約重修ヲシテ益難カラシムルニ過ス且歐洲各國ニ於テハ日本カ各國ニ満足ヲ與ルコンデシヨシニ至ラハ現行條約終期ノ權ヲ日本ニ與フヘシトハ至極無禮ノ口上ナリ之ヲ日本ニ於テ承諾スル時ハ日本ノ「ライト」ヲ剛ルモノナリ然リト雖モ今日日本政府ノ希望スル處隨テ森氏自身ニ於テ即今最要點ト考フル處ハ通商條約稅則ニ明カニ終期ヲ付シ此貿易事項ノミハ他ノ論題ニ關セス日本ニ全權ヲ取ル事ニ有之此事コソ英ヲ始メ歐洲各國政府カ承諾スル所トナル様我輩三人各處ニ在テ盡力セスンハア

蜂須賀公使閣下

註

1 及2 シーボルト、マチニ一談話書并淺野公使伊外務卿往復書翰ハ對伊交涉三九九及四〇〇、四〇一參照

三〇六 明治十六年十月十六日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

條件附定期結約問題ニ關スル件

内啓諸ハ條約改正事件ニ付是迄毎便申上候次第モ有之候得共即今ノ現況重複ヲ不顧爰ニ申上候  
過ル九月十五日附小生ヨリ電信ヲ呈シ通商條約稅則ニ明確ナル終期ヲ付シ締結相成候事本邦政府ノ御希望ニ可有之哉或ハ條約全部ニ獨白政府ノ發議ノ如クコンデシヨシ付キノ終期ヲ付シ候事本邦政府ニ於テ御承諾可相成哉ノ御電令ヲ乞ヒ置其後森氏スパー表ニ滯留中同二十二日附兩人連名電信ヲ呈シ前顯第一段ノ結約速ニ可相整都合ニ候得ハ第二段ノコンデシヨシ付キノ終期モ御承諾可相成段佛獨白等在日本公使ヘ貴君ヨリ御申入相成度意見電呈致シ候事ニ御座候處其後今日ニ至リ既ニ一ヶ月ヲ閱候得共何タル貴電令モ相受不致必當節ハ内閣ニ於テ右邊反覆御評議中ト拜察致居候

ルヘカラサル事ニテ英ニ對シテハ此明確ノ終期ヲ付セサル限リハ本邦政府新通商條約ノ締結ニ同意スヘカラスト迄申入ル心底ナレハ此點ニ於テ各國承諾スルニ於テハ獨白政府ノ發スル他條約全體ノ終期モ亦本邦政府ニ於テ其好意ヲ謝シテ承諾スルモ然ルヘシト小生マルシヤルモ數回談論ノ上森氏モ漸ク同意ト相成九月廿二日附森小生連名ノ電信ヲ呈シ候事ニ御座候而シテ本月八日森氏ロード、グランビルニ面會右意見陳述相成候由森氏談話書ハ本月十二日附森氏ヨリ機密信ヲ以貴君ヘ報告相成候由ニテ小生ヘモ右寫同氏ヨリ廻シ來リ候次第委曲御承知ノ筈ニ付爰ニ贅言不致候  
第二 青木公使ノ說ハ左ノ通

獨政府ニ於テハ元來日本ニ對シ他ニ比較スヘカラサル好意嚮ヲ持シ居ル事ニテ此度歐洲各國ヘ差出シタル回章ニハ即今ニ於テ日本ニ許與スヘキ條ハ餘サス漏サス掲載有之事故日本ニ於テハ何處迄モ之ヲ承諾不相成テハ實際上ニ關係シ如何ナル大事ヲ惹起ス哉モ難計依テ飽迄モ歐洲各國ヲシテ獨政府ノ發議ニ同意セシムルノ外無之トノ意ニテ隨テ埃國ヘハ青木氏自身出張同外務卿ニ面會英特ニ佛政府ヘ獨埃ノ意嚮ニ同意ヲ表スル様勸告ノ義ヲ倚賴シ又貴君ヨリ御電

令ノ趣モ有之ニ付森小生ト共ニブリユクセル府ニテ談決ノ上シールト氏ヲ伊國羅馬ニ派シ同氏淺野公使ノ譯官トシテ伊外務卿ニ面會ノ節モ亦獨政府ノ發議ヲ伊國ニ於テ同意ノ上ハ英佛等ニ同意セシムル様勸告ノ事ヲ倚賴セシメ候次第本月十一日附貴君ヘ小生ヨリノ呈書中ニ詳悉致居候通ニ有之森氏ノ説トハ全ク反對ノ如ク相見ヘ候然ルニ此節森氏ヘ青木氏ヨリノ書翰ニハ森氏ノ説ニ同意ノ段申越候哉ニ承知何分青木氏即今ノ意見不明瞭ニ有之其爲メ本月六日附小生ヨリ青木氏ヘ一書<sup>4</sup>(此書翰寫モ本月十一日附佛便ニ貴君ヘ寫差進置候)差送り有之返答夙夜相待申居候得共今ニ落手不致候尤青木氏ト小生トハ最モ一致盡力ノ目途有之青木氏ヨリモ小生ニ對シ至極懇親ノ意ヲ表サレ申候

第三 小生ニ於テハ森氏ノ説ニ於テ往々尤ニ相考候點モ有之通商條約稅則ニ定期立約ノ明文ヲ掲ケル事ハ東京豫議會ノ節ヨリ今日ニ至ル迄終始不相變不邦政府ノ御希望ト存候ニ付深ク此邊ヲ遵奉盡力可致ハ勿論ニ候得共前段ニ掲ケル小生ヨリ呈シ候九月十五日附ノ電信并ニ森小生兩人ヨリ呈シ候九月二十二日附ノ電信ニ對スル御電令ヲ日夜相待居候事ニテ然ル上ハ蓋即今不邦政府ノ御意嚮モ明瞭相成小生盡

十六年十月十六日夜認

茂 詔 拜

外務卿閣下

- 註 1 九月十五日蜂須賀公使發電信三〇二附屬書  
2 九月二十二日森蜂須賀兩公使發電信三〇三附屬書  
3 十月十二日附森公使機密信ハ二四四文書  
4 十月六日附蜂須賀公使ヨリ青木公使宛書翰ハ前號附屬書五

三〇七

明治十六年十月十六日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

佛國政府ヨリ覺書取付ケ方ノ件

過ル十二日發佛便ヲ以呈書致シ候節一言申上置候通同朝八月廿四日附ノ御內翰落掌難有拜讀候事ニ御座候御紙上佛政府カ東京事件ヨリシテ條約事件ニ色氣ヲ顯シ候ヲ我好具トスヘキ云々既ニ已ニ御電令ニモ其意ヲ御申越有之候事故今日迄モ遵奉取扱居ル事ニテ猶重々服膺從事可致候尤同政府ヲシテ變意セシメサル爲メニハ今日殊更ニ當方ヘメモランダムノ如キヲ領收致度申入候事ハ却テ如何可有之哉既ニ廿四日ノ貴書御認メ後御受取相成候佛外務卿ヨリ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇七

力ノ基可相立考居候事ニ御座候小生一己ノ説ヲ申サハ他ノ論題ニ關セス通商條約稅則ニ定期立約ノ明文ヲ掲ケル一條ハ最難事ニテ英ヲ始メ各國共迎モ承諾致ス間敷隨テ新通商條約締結ノ機會ヲ失ヒ可申哉ト深ク相恐レ申候故ニ森氏カ英外務卿ヘ申入タル「定期結約ノ明文ナクンハ我政府新通商條約締結ニ同意スル能ハス」トハ餘リ激烈ニ過キタル哉ト相考申候小生ノ考ニテモ森氏カ獨政府ノ發議ニ付テノ説ハ決テ無理ナラサル感觸ニテ或ハ其實ニ近キ哉モ難計候得共表面ハ何處迄モ獨政府ノ好意ヲ謝スルコソ我政府ニ取ツテ當然ニ可有之而シテコンデション付キ條約全部ノ終期ハ獨ノミナラス佛白埃伊等往々同意ニ傾クノ今日ナレハ日本ニ於テ承諾相成而シテ新通商條約ニハ定期立約ノ明文ヲ掲ケ得レハ重疊ノ事若シ彌各國ノ承諾ヲ得難ク見認ル時ハ定期立約ハ無クトモ速ニ新通商條約ヲ締結シ一日モ早く我內國財政ノ困難ヲ救ヒ候事今日ノ得策ト小生ハ相考申候森氏トハ此節屢書翰ヲ往復シ互ニ事情ヲ通シ申候青木氏ヘハ前顯ノ如ク本月六日送翰已來一兩度他用ニテ書翰相送候得共未タ何等ノ返答無之次第ニ御座候

右ハ即今ノ現況御參考ノ爲メ内々入貴聽候也

在英佛代理公使ヘノ訓令寫ハ當外務省通商局長ヨリ在白國佛公使ヲ經テ内々當方ヘ領收致候モノニテ貴君御希望ノメモランダムモ同様ノ功能有之様相考將來英ニ對シテハ勿論其他歐洲各國ヘ對シテモ決シテ變説シ能ハサルハ明瞭ト存ラレ候

在日本佛代理公使トノ御談話書モ篤ト拜見貴意ノ有ル所モ委曲拜察致シ候然ルニ佛代理公使小生ヨリマルシヤルヲ以先般公然トナク佛外務省ヘ通知致シ候三ヶ條ノ趣旨ニ付一ノ誤解有之様相考候何カト申ニ第一條ハ貿易事項ヲ他ノ論題ト分離スルノミニ無之ニ終期ヲ付スル事マルシヤル覺書ヲ以通知致シ有之候而シテ佛政府ハ之ヲ承諾シ同政府ヨリ英ヘノ回答中ニモ貿易事項ノ終期ヲ先ツ第一ニ掲ケ而シテ他條約全體ノ終期ヲモ發議シ二段ニ區別シ有之候事ハ疾ク御亮知被下候筈且事過候義ナカラ一應申上候

(以下省略)

十六年十月十六日

茂 詔 拜

外務卿閣下

猶々新田氏華族ニ被列候事深奉賀候東京一件ハ今日ニテ



ハ佛清雙方共内國ノ弱ミヲ考ヘ居候哉ノ模様和戰孰レニ決スルモ難計形勢ニ御座候也

當府海底電線會議今日初會有之マルシヤル出張致候也

三〇八 明治十六年十月二十六日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

## 佛外務卿談話書及マルシヤル氏報告送附ノ件

附屬書一 十六年十月一日佛外務卿蜂須賀公使對話書

二 十六年十月二十日附歐洲ノ形勢ト我條約改正ニ關スルマルシヤル報告書

三 十六年十月二十日附我條約改正ニ對スル歐洲外交界ノ意見ニ付マルシヤル報告書

四 十六年十月二十日附マルシヤル氏佛外務省政務局長談話書

機密信 第七拾二號

十二月十一日到

條約改正一條此頃御電報ノ趣モ有之本月十日佛外務卿接待日ニ付小官外務省ヘ出頭談話ノ要領別紙甲號壹冊差進候マルシヤル氏報告書乙丙丁號三冊モ御參考ノ爲メ差進候右乙號ハ歐洲ノ近況不穩ノ姿アルニ付若シ歐洲ニ戰爭相初ルノ日ニ方リ我改正事件ニ波及スヘキ影響、丙號ハ獨白政府

ヨリ英政府ヘ回答ノ條約改正事件ニ係ル見解、丁號ハ「マルシヤル」氏ト佛外務省政務局長 Biot 氏ト改正一條ノ談話書ニ有之候此旨申進候也

明治十六年十月廿六日

在佛特命全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

## 外務卿井上馨殿

附屬書一

甲號 十六年十月十日佛外務卿蜂須賀公使談話書

十月十日佛外務卿接待日ニ付キ外務省ヘ出頭小官ト外務卿シヤルメルラクル氏トノ談話左ノ如シ

小官曰

余數月間兼任國旅行致シ居過月廿九日歸巴致シタルニ付キ久々ニテ拜話ノ榮ヲ得ル爲メ出頭致シタリ偕今日閣下ニ謝セント欲スル事ハ曩ニ英政府カ我條約改正事件ニ關シ發議ヲ爲シタルニ付去七月佛政府ヨリ其回答差出サレ我國ノ爲メ好意ヲ示サレタル事ヲ傳聞セシ事はレナリ而シテ其要點ヲ舉レハ第一ニ英政府カ發議シタル無期立約ノ意嚮ニ反シ我政府ノ主張スル有期結約ノ主義ヲ佛政府ヨリ回答中ニ發

議セラレシ事第二ニ通商事項ト其他ノ事項トヲ區別シテ條約ヲ改竊セント欲スル我政府東京會議ニ於テノ發議ヲ旨トシ佛政府回答中ニ此ノ區別ヲ維持掲載セラレシ事我政府ノ爲メ多謝スル處ナリ然ルニ余此際猶閣下ノ好意ヲ希望スルハ通商條約ニ約束ヲ附セサル的確ナル終期ノ條項ヲ掲ケル事ナリ今日余カ閣下ニ陳述スルハ我政府ノ訓令ヲ受ケテ陳述スルニハ無之ト雖トモ此終期ノ問題ハ我政府ノ此際希望スル要點ト信スルカ故佛政府ニ於テ歐洲各國ト共ニ此希望ヲ承諾セラレン事閣下ノ高配ヲ仰ク處ナリ而シテ此ノ余ノ陳述ハ去ル七月佛政府ヨリ英政府ヘ回答中ニ前段述ルカ如ク既ニ通商事項ト他ノ事項トノ區別ヲ掲ケラレシ好意ニ起因スルモノナリ

佛外務卿曰

日本政府ニ快キ事日本政府ノ希望ニ應諾スル事ハ余モ亦希望スル所ナリ乍併佛國政府モ亦日本ニ向テ希望スル事アリ譬ヘハ歐人ノ日本内地旅行ヲ容易クスル事通商ノ爲メ内地ニ住居スル事「Etablissent dans l'interieur pour le commerce」等ノ如シ改正ニ係ル歐洲諸國ノ意嚮ハ閣下モ定メテ御承知ナラン然ルニ今閣下ノ陳述セラル、如ク通

シ日本ニ厚意ヲ示サレシ故今陳述スル點ニ於テモ尙閣下ノ厚意ヲ得シ事ヲ希望ス

佛外務卿

貴政府ニ於テ相互調和讓與 arrangement et conciliation  
ノ精神ヲ以テ條約改正ヲ研究スルニ於テハ余モ亦同一ノ精  
神ヲ以テ此問題ヲ研究ス可シ 終

附屬書二

乙號 十六年十月二十日附歐州ノ形勢ヲ我條約改正ニ關スルマシ  
ンヤン報告書

#### Memorandum

as to the effect which a war in Europe  
would exercise on the revision of the  
treaties with Japan.

Paris, 20 October, 1883.

Thirteen European countries have treaties with Japan. The interests and objects of those thirteen countries are substantially identical towards Japan; there may be differences on points of detail, one country, for instance, may desire lower customs

duties than another on certain articles of exportation to Japan, according to the nature of its manufactures; but, politically and generally, in all that concerns the dominant motives and the essential springs of inter-continental action between the East and the West, the thirteen countries may be said to be animated by the same guiding ideas and to pursue the same results in their relations with Japan. They are more or less generous, more or less liberal, more or less just in their manner of carrying out these ideas and of attaining these results, but, viewed as a whole, their attitude is, in its main outlines, the same everywhere because their interests, their opinions and their prejudices are everywhere the same.

The consequence is that they have always regarded the revision of the treaties with Japan as a question which concerns them collectively, as an element of the dealings of Europe with Asia, as a matter which affects Europe in its aggregate capacity as much as it affects the particular interests of each of the countries which compose Europe.

nothing.

Japan should, therefore, regard the revision as an act which is realisable only at a time of general peace, and would do well to take note of the circumstances which might place peace in peril and, consequently, endanger the revision.

It is generally felt in Europe that possible causes of war are, at this moment, unusually numerous, wide-spread, and grave; one of the principal arguments at present employed in favor of the probability of preserving peace is, indeed, that as so many risks of war exist without having hitherto produced war, it may be hoped that things will go on as they are. There is some truth in this view, and it is also true that all Europe shrinks from war and will make great efforts to avoid it, especially as every one believes that, if war once began, all the Powers would be dragged into it by the multiplicity of complications. But still it must be remembered that a provocation which is considered insufficient today may become sufficient tomorrow, that patience and prudence wear out, and, above all, that new

The thirteen countries have therefore made common cause with each other about the revision and it is understood between them that the revision is to be effected by agreement between them all, as a matter relating equally to them all. And, however much Japan may disapprove and deplore this common action of Europe towards her, it must be expected that it will be maintained until the present treaties are entirely terminated. There may be (there are, indeed, already) divergences of disposition and of tendency, but those divergences will not suffice to dissolve the unity of action of Europe.

All this, however, refers to the action of Europe during a state of peace. What would be the effect produced on the revision by a war in Europe?

To this question it may be answered, with certainty, that a war between European Powers would stop the revision altogether, for the two reasons that the belligerents would cease to give thought to it and that the neutrals would invoke the suspension of European unity and the impossibility of isolated arrangements as motives for doing

events, new accidents may occur and that unforeseen passions may burst out.

First amongst the possible causes of war stands the general impression of distrust and disapprobation which has been aroused throughout Europe, during the last two or three years, by the rash foreign enterprises and disorderly home action of France. The permanent enmity between France and Germany may be placed second. The latent ill-will between Russia and Germany may be put third. The projects of suppression of European Turkey which are attributed to Austria and Germany, and which would be opposed by Russia and England, come forth. The excitable and somewhat unscrupulous ambition of Italy comes fifth; it very nearly provoked a rupture between her and France two years ago. The relations between France and Spain have been strained of late. The doubts about the succession to the Crown of Holland, and the possible effects of an arrangement thereon with Germany, must not be forgotten. And to all these special contingencies in Europe must be added the accidents

# 法國聲明

巴黎十月十四日倫敦電報云「法蘭西政府於今日對歐洲各國發表聲明書」

## Memorandum

on the present situation of the revision,  
as European diplomatic opinion seems to  
view it.

Paris, 20 October 1883.

The *principle* of terminability appears to be admitted by a large majority of the European Powers. There is, therefore, no exaggeration in supposing that the resistance of the minority will be overcome, sooner or later, and that all Europe will finally agree to offer total terminability to Japan, on conditions and in a form to be determined.

Now, according to the information recently collected from a variety of diplomatic sources, it is beyond doubt that Europe will regard this act (supposing it to be realised) as a remarkable and surprising one on her part. For the first time in

which so frequently happen outside Europe, like the recent difficulties in Madagascar, the influence on Europe of a war between France and China, and the slow but steady advance of Russia towards British India.

No one of these matters can be said to present, at this moment, a character of immediate danger; but, with such a variety of possible risks in the air, it is natural that Europe should be uneasy and that confidence in the maintenance of peace should not be absolute and unhesitating.

It would be well for Japan to take these considerations into account and to ask herself what would become of her revision if, unhappily, a European war did break out before the revision is concluded. In determining the attitude (sic) to be adopted when the collective proposals of Europe are laid before Japan, this grave element of the situation should be duly weighed. It might be prudent not to lose time; present opportunities might disappear, and, if they did disappear, when would they come again?

history she will declare her willingness to liberate an Asiatic nation from its signature and to leave it free to fix its own relations with the world; for the first time in history she will abandon the policy she has unceasingly followed towards non-Christian nations for three centuries and a half (since the original Capitulations were made with Turkey) and will assist an Asiatic Government to undo the knots which treaties have tied around it. Japan, the last to sign such treaties, is to be the first to get rid of them; it is for *her—for her alone*—that this exception is to be made.

It is, evidently, the general opinion of European diplomatists that this new and striking situation, so full of present significance and of future consequences, will give to Japan a place apart in history, because it will render her relations with the world altogether special to herself.

The view of Europe (supposing it to be generally adopted) would be that Japan is to acquire entire treaty liberty on the single condition that she shall use it towards foreigners as European nations use

it towards each other. It is supposed in Europe that Japan cannot desire more than this, for the reason that in no way can she more completely attain the imperial rights and the international equality which she claims than by an exact assimilation and application of the treatment which European nations show to each other. And that is precisely what is proposed by the German and Belgian Notes. European nations open their territories to each other and accept each other's jurisdiction, and, by the present proposals, Europe asks neither more nor less from Japan. She says to Japan, "Do as I do; open your territory and give me a jurisdiction I can accept; the moment you do that I will tear up the present treaties; but so long as you do not do that there is no international equality between us, because you do not open your territory to me as I open mine to you." Treaty liberty for Japan depends, therefore, in the opinion of Europe, on Japan herself. Europe thinks that she is asking nothing of Japan in proposing to her to act as Europe herself acts in the two matters of judicial organisation and of free

circulation throughout the country; her impression is that such a proposal is honourable to Japan.

In answer to all this the opinion of Japan would appear to be that the proposed action of Europe is insufficient, because the commercial part of the treaties is not made definitely terminable, and, perhaps also, because conditions are attached to the offer of terminability for the rest of the Treaty.

This objection results, of course, from the natural fact that in Japan the purely Japanese elements of the subject are those which are most thought of, while its European aspects receive less consideration. Europe considers, however, that the European aspects of the matter merit as much attention as the Japanese elements, that the matter is full of difficulties and of grave importance for Europe, and that so profound a change in the entire traditional policy of Europe needs some preparation. And, according to the dispositions she has manifested recently, she would probably go on to say that even if this great change concerned no one but Japan herself it could not, by possibility, extend beyond

the total treaty liberty which Europe now proposes to her. It would certainly be thought and said, by Europe, that on higher satisfaction for the national pride of Japan could possibly be conceived than the abandonment by the West, *toward her alone*, of the shows that if Japan were to decline to revise at all because Europe was unwilling to give unconditional

terminability on commercial questions, such a refusal would upset all that has been achieved on the Continent and would alienate the sympathies which have been so slowly and so laboriously awakened towards Japan. The effect would be all the more disastrous because of the conviction of Europe that her present proposals are extraordinarily advantageous for Japan.

It should be repeated that the question is a general whole affecting all Europe together; it cannot, by its nature, depend on the will any single Power; great as is the influence of Germany and of England with respect to it, even they are not masters of it; the issue does not lie in Berlin, in Paris, in London, or anywhere in particular, but in

the accord of all the Governments together. When that accord has been rendered as favorable as possible to Japan, when the *best* has been reached, Europe will certainly be surprised if her proposal are rejected by Japan.

#### 通譯附記

上巻 十次十回十回十回十回十回十回十回十回十回十回  
Paris, 20 October 1883.

Conversation between Marshall and Mr.  
Billot, Political Director in the French  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

*Marshall.* The communication made by France to England in July with reference to the revision of the Japanese treaties has been very useful to Japan, for it put forward, for the first time, the principle of terminability; but it was vague and incomplete and it did not supply a plan of arrangement. It was followed by proposals of a more precise nature from other Governments, but those proposals suggested the terminability of the treaties as a whole, without

distinction of parts, while the French Note in accordance with the request I had made to you in May, recommended that the commercial and judicial portions should be made terminable separately. Mr. Hachisuka has received no definite instructions as yet on the subject, but he has reason to suppose that the Japanese Government will desire to maintain the distinction between the terminabilities of the commercial and judicial parts of the treaties. It is to be expected, also, that the Japanese Government will wish, not only that the terminability of the commercial parts shall be separated from the rest, but, furthermore, that it shall be, in itself, distinct and unconditional. I have a conversation on this point with the Commercial Director; he advised me to see you upon it, and the object of my visit today is to put the matter before you and to ask for your support in it.

(Marshall then gave detailed explanations).

*Billot.* As the subject is new to me I can only make a personal and private answer; before I can say anything positive I must talk to the Commercial

nise the reality of the progress of Japan, that you believe it will continue, and that you have confidence in the use which Japan would make of the freedom she claims. All the commercial treaties of Europe have a definite duration; they come to an end, new arrangements are discussed, according to the circumstances, and new treaties are made in the place of the old ones. That is what Japan wants and no one can pretend that she would misuse such a right.

*Billot.* I cannot admit the parallel you draw between the commercial treaties of Europe and those of Japan; the two cases are totally different. In Europe we are all neighbours, in intimate relation with each other and in close dependance on each other; we *need* each other's trade, it is the essence of our international life; commerce has become the basis, the bond and the object of our connection with each other, and when a commercial treaty between any of us comes to an end we are *forced*, by public opinion and by public necessities, to renew it, somehow. But Japan stands towards us in no

Director and to the Minister; but, personally and privately, I have no hesitation in telling you, have given me, that I am fully disposed to admit your request. Of course I may have to say the contrary when I speak officially, after discussion in the Ministry, but my individual view, at present, is that we ought to be able to consent. Remember, however, that we must act in accord with the other Powers and that if France accepts such a plan and proposes it to Europe and recommends it to the acceptance of Europe, she would have no chance of success unless she put forward simultaneously an answer to the objection which will manifestly be made everywhere. Every one will ask, "Well, but if we set Japan free from her commercial engagements towards us, what guarantee have we that she will renew them at all; what certainty have we that she will not profit by her liberty to close the country again and to have no more to do with us?"

*Marshall.* Surely you do not say that seriously? The very fact that France and other Powers have proposed terminability is proof that you all recog-

such situation as that; nothing you can say will make Europe believe that Japan feels these questions as we do; our opinion in them are the fruit of particular experience, they are the consequence of an international trade so enormous and so profitable that it has become one of the great levers of our epoch. Japan, however, has no such motives, she has neither our wants, nor our habits, nor our views; geographically she is to far off, commercially she is too undeveloped, politically she is too young and too unpractised in such questions, for us to admit that she *can* regard them as Europe does. There may be in Japan some few persons understand them, but you will never persuade me that the Japanese, nationally, feel, as we feel it, the *obligatory need* of treaties in order not only to regulate, but also to assist and promote their commerce with the rest of the world. Consequently, as I said just now, the conditions are different; Japan has *not* the same ideas or the same motives as we have, and I warn you that whatever France may decide to say in support of the definite terminability of your com-

mercial treaties, Europe will refuse that terminability unless she can feel *certain* that you will not quash the treaties altogether. I in no way refer to *modifications* of the treaties; it would be perfectly natural that you should *alter* them as you desired, if you were free to do so; I would even admit that you might impose protective duties on certain articles, if you thought fit; but what I cannot admit, and what no one would admit, is that you should be left at liberty to *suppress* the treaties.

*Marshall.* I assure you that you are supposing an impossibility. Japan has no more idea than France has of suppressing the treaties; what she wants is the same sort of liberty that France possesses, and she wants it for the same purposes and would employ it in the same manner.

*Billot.* I repeat that protestations of that sort will not convince Europe. Europe will want realities, not words. Do not waste your time in trying to convince me. I am talking to you confidentially and frankly and I tell you that, to succeed in such a matter as this, we must find a solution which will

satisfy Europe. It is from that point of view that I will examine the question and I think I see plans which are worth consideration. The difficulty is clear. I will do what I can; rely on that.

*Marshall.* Well, there is one plan which would be of a nature to satisfy everybody. It would be to put a stipulation into the revised treaties that Japan can alter them when she becomes free, but that she cannot suppress them. Of course I mention that idea as a purely personal one without any authority; but I should think the Japanese Government would be willing to adopt such a condition.

三〇九 明治十一年一月三日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

### 條約有効期限問題ニ關スル獨佛ノ態度報告ノ件

- 附屬書一 十月十八日附青木公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使宛内信
- 二 十月二十六日附蜂須賀公使ヨリ青木公使宛内信
- 三 十月二十三日附蜂須賀公使宛往電

拜啓倍ハ先便青木公使へ改正一件ニ付一書差送候爲進呈致置候處右ニ對スル同氏ヨリノ返翰別紙<sup>1</sup>號寫ノ通り到來致候ニ付猶又乙號寫<sup>2</sup>ノ通小生ヨリ再答致置候ニ付御參考ノ爲メ貴覽ニ備へ候此往復書翰ノ爲メニ協和ノ妨ケト相成候義ハ萬々有之間敷無腹臆事情ヲ通シ候事一致ノ基ト相考候猶去ル九月十五日小生電信ニ對シタル貴答ハ入り組ミ候事多ク郵便ニテ御示令可有之段過日貴電報相達右郵便相待居候事ニ御座候右様要計草々内啓如此御座候也

十六年十一月三日

西班牙國マドリツド府ヨリ 茂 詔

馨賢臺閣下

(追申省略)

註 1、2、3 夫々附屬書一、二、三參看

### 附屬書一

甲號 十六年十月十八日附青木公使ヨリ蜂須賀公使宛内信

本月十日附ノ貴書正ニ拜讀依テ早速拙答可差出答ノ處貴書滿面ノ語氣ニ徴スレバ當日頗ル「エキサイト」被成居候歟ニ致推察候間態ト拙答差控申候要スルニ御五貴重ノ國務ヲ執掌スルニ方リ彼此往復上ニ於テ誤解相生候テハ千萬々々

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 三〇九

1001

遺憾ノ至ニ有之申候依テ來示ノ質疑ニ對シ左ノ條々達貴問候間篤ト御一覽ノ上尙ホ貴意ニ觸レ且御了解難相成候事項有之候ハハ折返シ又々何分ノ義御申越可被下候

一、本年九月十七日我外務卿宛ノ拙電信中

the termination of tariff subject to further agreement as to the opening of the country

ノ文字有之候處其趣意ハ「マルシヤル」氏探知ノ實ト相達ス云々御申越有之候處通商條約稅則(貴書ノ文字ニ據ル)ニノミ關シ獨政府ヨリ終期ヲ發言シタル義ニハ無之候即九月卅日附外務卿宛拙電信中

as to German intention relative to terminability, I am sure that it refers *not only* to tariff but to *all treaties*. They will kindly effectuate in favour of Japan the *recognition of this principle in general*

ノ文字御參考被下候得ハ詳細敢テ説明ヲ要セスト存申候又十七日拙電信中

Whether the opening is under an entire or partial abolishment of extritorial jurisdiction

or whether the opening means entire opening and enjoyment of all right in the interior or mere travelling for commercial pursuits is left an open question

ノ義御了解難相成何トナレバ獨政府ヨリ發言セル開國トノ義ハ悉皆開全國トノ意味ニ相違無之又果テ開國ノ場合ニ立至リ候ハ、治外法權ヲ解クト同時ニ條約ノ期限モ明ニ終ル事ト御承知ニ有之候處小生ノ電信中ニハ全開半開ノ義今ヤ不定ノ疑問ニ付ラル、ガ如キニ付亦「マルシヤル」氏探知ノ實ニ相違ス云々御申越有之候然ニ此點ニ關係テハ先日入内覽候我機密信中ノ注解等篤ト御推考於有之テハ決テ貴我ノ際誤解可相生筈無之様存申候何トナレバ貴書ニモ説明有之候通り條約惣體ノ「コンデション」ヲ付シ其終期ヲ八年ト定メ置キ其期ニ至リ自我可充塞「コンデション」ノ義ニ付我彼間ノ協議不相整候ニ於テハ重テ該終期ヲ延引スル都合ニモ可相成候併シ八年ノ期ニ至リ於我ハ、terminatory rightノ回復ヲ幾望スルハ勿論ニ可有之依テ其節自我we consider treaties as expired, as far as we

然ル時ハ the terminating rightヲ回復スル事ハ我政府最大ノ幾望ニ有之候處前段申述候通り八年後ニ至リ開國ノ規約尙ホ各條約國ノ意ニ不相稱トテ豈回復ノ手段ヲ尙四年或ハ八年ヲ期シ左置不問ニ付シテ可ナラシヤ況ンヤ今後八年間ニハ開明ノ事業頗ル可進其歩尤其功歐洲各國ノ成績ニ同一ナラントノ事ハ確乎難相保候得共姑ク立法司法ノ區域ニ就テ致想像候ニ八年間ニハ稍ク佛國ノ五典ニ類似スル位ノ法律編集モ可相整且我裁判官ノ資格モ可相崇候ニ付該事實ヲ證左シ各國ニ迫リテ必ズヤ其優待(a better treatment than hithertoノ意)ヲ請求セザル可ラズ假令ハ abolishment of extritorial jurisdictionニ關シ候ハハ各國尙ホ我幾望ヲ認可セストモ the terminating right 丈ハ是非々々認可致サセ度義ニ有之申候但シ八年後我進歩ノ事實ヲ證左スルモ該權回復ヲ請求セハ各國共必其償價トシテ何等歟請求申出候半(況ンヤ今獨白ノ建言被相行候ニ於テハ本權回復ハ全ク「コンデション」ニ關スルニ於テヤヤ)殆ド可豫知義ニ有之候左スレバ我政府更ニ相關ノ手段ヲ假用シ some concession for

are ready according to the condition to open the country, but under the condition that the Japanese laws should be applicable also to foreigners in every respect, that is the final abolishment of the extritorial jurisdiction

云々致發議候半ニ會テ我外務卿致掛念候通り各條約國(the Japanese laws are not yet codified all, or they are not made according to Western idea or judges are not qualified &c. &c.ノ口實ヲ維持シ)前顯「コンデション」ヲ認可不致モ難計存候其際ニ臨シ候ハ、御説ノ如ク四年或ハ八年等ノ期限ヲ一定シ更ニ開國ノ舉ヲ見合スル事モ可有之候處左スレバ Treaties do not expire and the extritorial jurisdiction does not abolishノ情況正敷其 consequence ナルベシ此故アルヲ以テ我外務卿ハ新稅則ニ關スル終期ヲ可成 unconditionallyニ取付度不得止ル、by the concession of the coasting trade for 5 years in accordance with principle contained in protocol &c. &c.之ニ致領收度決意ニ相見ノ申候

instance, the travelling for commercial pursuits in the interior, provided that the consular jurisdiction should be then at least modified according (to?) our proposals made at Conferenceヲ交付シテ the recognition of our terminating rightヲ領收スル agreementヲ致招致候テモ可然歟ニ存申候要スルニ今ヤ八年ヲ限り規約相結置候半ニ八年後ニ至リ更ニ數年ヲ期シテ稅關回復不相成候テハ萬々困却ノ至ニ候間今ヨリ八年後ニ係候我政府ノ actionsハ可成 freeニ保持不致置テハ不相叶候抑先前小生儀我外務卿ノ意嚮ヲ體認シ獨政府ニ就テ the terminating rightニ unconditionallyニ認可可然云々申入候節該政府ノ所見ニテハ無規約的ニ該權利ヲ回復スル事到底難被行ニ付 the effective exercise of this right should be depended(dependent?) upon opening of country under condition acceptable by (to?) Powersノ主義ニ據テ斡旋可相試メノ事ニ有之候併シ純然タル我政府ノ趣旨ハ the opening of whole country should be depended(dependent?)

upon the abolishment or at least upon the introducing of the proposed modification of the consular jurisdiction 且 terminating right ハ可成的 unconditionally or unimportant concession (as above mentioned) ヲ以テ領收スル確意ニ相見候間該兩箇ノ疑問ヲ引離シ是非各自ノ understanding ヲ招來シ度特ニ稅權回復ノ義開國ノ疑問ニ關係ナク認可可然云々小生ヨリ十分議論ケ間敷申張候得共獨政府ハ確乎前顯ノ主意ヲ維持シ且懇諭的小生ヘ申聞候ニハ定期前後日本國開明ノ事業進其歩候ハ其程度ニ準ジ更ニ商議ノ手段該手段ト申語氣中 entirely or partial opening of country and entirely or partial abolishment of consular jurisdiction ノ意味アリシ都合ナリ) 可有之トノ事ニ有之候依テ拙電信中半開全開ノ義全ク我手中ニアリト報道致シ候都合ニ有之候但シ半開トハ不明言候得共斯字句ハ來書ニ照據致シ候萬一九月十七日附拙電信御謄寫無之候ハ照據ノ爲メ重テ可致進送候要スルニ八年後ニ至リ我政府ヘ free action ヲ與ヘ且我 jurisdiction et justitia ノ兩項ニ

シテ可ナリ整頓致シ候ハ治外法權ヲ廢止スル事ニ付獨政府ハ(塊モ亦然ラン) 不同意不申張意嚮ニ有之候旨先前ヨリ内聞致シ居候間此亦御參考ノ爲申出置候右兩款ニ關スル答詞ハ頗ル長文ニ相成候得共彼は御照考被下度左候ハ、貴拙問ノ誤解減其跡候事ト存候將又御束書中「佛政府ノ發議ニハ通商條約稅則ノ終期ト他條約惣體ノ終期ト二段ニ區別シテ發議致シ有之是ハ日本政府東京豫議會ノ節ヨリ今日ニ至ル迄始終變セザル企望ト承知致シ居候ニ付佛ノ回答ハ本邦ノ企望ニ符合スルモノト相考然ルニ貴君并シーボルト氏ヨリ既ニ御勸告相成候通り澳伊兩國政府ニ於テ獨政府ノ發議ニ同意シ佛政府ヘ斡旋有之時ハ或ハ日本ニ於テ企望スル如ク終期ヲ二段ニ區別スル佛政府ノ意ヲ止メ獨政府發議スル區別ナキ條約全體ノ終期ニ同意セシムルヲ望ムニ相當リ或ハ後日混雜可相生哉ト苦慮ス云々尤慥ニ獨政府ニ於テハ通商條約稅則ノ終期ヲ發議シ而シテ他條約全體ノ終期ヲモ亦發議セシニ相違ナシトノ御返答相伺候得バ小生ニ於テ安心可致存候云々ノ御質疑有之候處貴君ニシテ此點ニ疑ヲ御抱被成候義萬々意外ニ存中候獨政府好意ヲ以テ斡旋ノ勞ヲ擔任候以上ハ勿論日本政府ノ幾望ヲ認了シ

テコソ舉動スル都合ニ有之候抑如來論通商條約ト自他條約トハ引離シテ致結納トノ義我政府ノ幾望ニ有之候間獨政府ハ確乎其意ヲ體シ居候(亦マルシヤル氏八月三十日報道書中ニ有之候通) 其證左ハ臆察ヲ要セス九月廿一日附我外務卿ヨリ御五ニ宛候電信中 German minister assured Inoue of German intention and said: they consent (to?) the separate settlement of commercial parts 云々即是ナリ然ル以上ハ通商事項(稅則固ヨリ之ニ加入ス)ニ關スル條約ヲ八年ノ終期ニテ可結納トノ趣意ニ有之候然ルニ今後(但シ今後トハ明春ニテ於東京再ビ開商議ノ期ヲ云フ)自他ノ事項(即アトミニストレーションノ疑問等是ナリ)ニ關シ條約相整候半ニ該條約中終期ノ豫定(裁判疑問ニ關スルトナレバ我政府モ決意ハ十二年ト明言シタリ)無之テハ不都合千萬ニ付該條約ニモ必終期ヲ豫定スル趣意ニ有之候故ニ獨政府ノ趣意ハ正數マルシヤル氏探知ノ實ニ相違無之反之今回御申越有之候貴察ニハ相反シ居申候勿論自他事項ニ關スル條約惣體ニ付スル終期年限ヲ五年十年或ハ十二年ト確定スル事ハ matter of next negotiation in Tokio たり抑區別ナキ終期云々貴察或ハ誤解相生候ハ定

テ拙電信中(九月卅日ノ分)

As to German intention relative to terminability, I am sure that it refers not only to tariff but to all treaties, they will kindly effectuate in favour of Japan the recognition of this principle in general ノ文字ニ起因致シ候半察申候併シ雷ニ稅則ノミナラズ自他ノ條約ニモ關係ストノ意味ハ前段ノ陳述ノ趣意ニ有之候畢竟從前ノ條約ハ permanent character ニ候間該性質ヲ排棄シ各條約ヲシテ terminable ノ性質ニ致シ度事ハ固ヨリ我本望ニ有之候依テ最前獨政府ヨリ「テルミネーションハ「コース」ハ單ニ稅則ニ關係サスル趣意ナル歟云々質疑有之節ハ小生言ヲ返シ「否々通商條約ハ其通用規限ヲ八年トナシ自他條約ハ十二年タルベシトノ我建言ニ照據シ何等條約ニ關セズ今後ニ可結納分ニハ各己々々ニ豫定シタル termination clause 勿ル可ラズ要スルニ terminating or better denouncing right 丈ハ是非々々各條約ニ關シ(即前英文中 in general ノ意也)認可可然云々」申込置候次第ニ御座候該權果シテ認可セラレ候上ハ今後商議ニ由リ通商條約ヲ八年トナシ自他條約ヲ五年トナス等全ク我權利ニ



可有之候依テ the right of denouncing in general  
ニ取付候事最肝要ニ可有之候右ハ小生我政府ノ意味ヲ取違  
ヘザル積リニテ獨政府ヘ建言シ且獨政府モ小生ノ言ヲ宜ナ  
リト聞込吳候參リ掛ニテ有之候然ルニ此段ニ付貴拙ノ間誤  
解ノ邊萬々遺憾不少候勿論九月三十日小生ヨリ本邦ヘ差立  
候電信ノ字句ハ他ノ公信等ニモ關係有之隨テ御了解難相成  
廉モ可有之候得共 it refers not only to tsriff but to all  
treaties ノ文字ヨリシテ區別ナキ終期云々ノ誤解相生候ハ  
實ニ意外ニ存申候特ニマルシヤル氏ベルン府ヨリノ報道書  
中第五葉目ニ於テハ the claim of Japan to the right  
of denouncing the treaties ト條約ノ字ヲ複數ニテ相用  
居候ニ於テヤ併シ彼此御照考有之候ハ、誤解頓排スル事  
ト幾望罷在申候

將又拙電信(九月十七日ノ分)中——ノ文字ニ徴スルニ英  
ト佛ト全ク日本ニ抗議シ好意不相示モノ、如ク又同月十七  
日附拙機密信中ニモ英佛共ニ抗議イタシ歡心不相顯云々小  
生ヨリ申出シ候段於貴君甚意外ニ御考相成候トノ來諭并ニ  
佛國政府ノ好意ヲ維持スルニ相違無之證左等御來示有之致  
承知甚奇異ノ感覺ヲ生申候況ンヤ御來書中「小生任國ノ政

### gages to our interests

トノ意ハ重モニ我外務卿(都合ニヨリ開國スレバスクスル  
ト今ヨリ「コンデション」定メタキ歟ニ申越タ事アリ)ノ  
電信ニ答候處抑開國云々ニ就テハ我 jurisdiction et jus-  
titia ノ權利ニ論及不致テ不相叶併シ該件ニ關係テハ佛政  
府多分英政府ノ意嚮ニ左袒スルナラン七月七日附其外務卿  
訓令中ニモ單ニ英政府ノ所見(我法律ノ譯未成候ニ付云々)  
ヲ記載セルノミニテ別ニ開國一項ニ係ル文字無之然ル時ハ  
開國ヲ要シ裁判權ヲ歸復スルトノ事ハ兩政府ノプログラム  
中ニ無之候(亦パークス及トリク一兩氏ノ本意ナラン)故  
ニ該件ハ matter of further negotiation or an open  
question in this moment トナス方可然トノ趣意ニ有之  
中候

又同日附機密信中獨政府建議ノ大體ニ於テ除英佛之外強テ  
抗議申張ル者無之尤佛特ニ英政府抗議候テハ到底好結果難  
招致ニ付先日外務卿代理者某氏ニ就テ云々又本件將結局ノ  
瞬間ニ方リ拱手英佛政府ノ偏頗的抗議ニ被打勝候テハ遺憾  
云々トノ意ハ憑據非無之候其箇條ヲ枚舉セバ佛政府事

第一、通商事件ヲ治定スルニ不同ナケレドモ新稅則(此

府ノ好意ヲ不好意ノ如ク貴君ヨリ相伺候ニ付一身上不足ヲ  
申入候心底ハ毛頭無之又小生當府ニテノ働キハ貴君ガ塊伊  
等ヘ御勸告相成候次第ニ寄リ働キ甲斐ナシトテ不平ヲ唱ル  
ニモ決テ無之」云々ノ文字有之候得共如何ニモ小生義妄リ  
ニ英佛ヲ譏議シ有モノヲ無キヨウニ取成シ又ハ貴君ノ御盡  
力ヲ蔑視シ却テ小生ノ働ヲ驕誇的ニ街賣セント申様ニ御考  
有之候半歟ト掛念罷在申候然ルニ卑意ノ方嚮ハ全ク之ニ反  
シ隨テ從前ヨリ所業上ニモ斯ル卑劣ノ形跡ヲ表セシ事ハ無  
之候勿論爲國一大事ヲ執筆スルニ際シ候テハ不得已場合ニ  
會セバ區々タル私竊ノ情實ヲ顧省スル譯ニモ難參候ハン併  
シ其場合ニ於ルモ人ノ功ヲ減シ自分ノ功トナス等ノ事ハ於  
小生不爲覺悟ニ有之申候況ンヤ御互ニ co-ordinated 官員  
トシテ同一ノ事件ヲ負擔スルニ於テヤ乍去佛政府ノ好意  
不好意ニ關スル一件ニ付テハ必ヤ裁書中ノ文字ニ照據シテ  
辯解セザル可ラズ依テ左ニ其細縷ヲ啓シ候  
九月十七日拙電信中

with the present determination of England and France any attempt at settling now the mode and principle of opening could only produce disadvan-

案タル御承知ノ如ク全ク東京豫議會員ノ製作シタルモノ  
ニシテ我政府并豫議員ハ之ヲ認可シタリ故ニ獨政府ニ於  
テハ該案ニ異議セバ其代理員即豫議會ニ列セシ者ヲシテ  
食言サスル道理タルニ付其儘「アクセプト」スルトノ見  
込ニ有之候於佛モ同様ニ考吳可然存候)ヲ「アクセプト」  
スルニハ「コンデション」ニ致シ現ニ sous réserve de  
la suppression du droit de sortie sur les soies de  
quelques ameliorations de détail ト申出シタリ

第二、七月七日佛外務卿訓令書中第五及第六款ノ云々は  
ナリ此義ニ付テハ我外務卿ノ電信佛政府ノ發議ハ英政府  
ノ發議ニ齊シト「ラブセルベーション」モ有之程ニテ  
其實誠ニ不定ノ申分是ナリ

但シ佛政府ノ情況ハ小生ノ知ル處ニ非ス主トシテ貴君御承  
知ノ事故固ヨリ小生不問然ノミナラス好意アルトノ御通知  
ハ致確信候又不好意アル由縁モ無之候併シ右二條ニ付佛政  
府事折合吳候ハ、至妙ナレトモ獨ヨリ強テ勸告相成云々  
(此義ハ先達テ拜話ノ節巨細ニ達貴聞置候)トノ事ニ有之  
申候是即前段英佛ヲ除ノ外ト不邦ヘ報告致シ候所以ナリ又  
抗議候テハ反偏頗論ニ被打勝候テハ遺憾云々正シク豫防的

ノ言語ニ外ナラス候依テ小生ヨリ澳國へ申込シールト氏ヨリ伊國へ申込候際ニモ事實ヲ證明シ此廉其廉ニ付佛國不同意ヲ中張候條勸告有之度ト明言セシニ非ス要スルニ東洋疑問中英佛輒主唱者タルニ付右兩政府間ニ斡旋シ須ク我政府ノ幾望ヲ充塞セシムベシトコソ申込候都合ナリ佛政府ノ好意ニシテ全體今少シ顯著ニ七月七日附書帖ニ相見ヘ候得ハ右等ノ事モ倚賴セスシテ可ナレトモ實ニ過日御目ニ掛リ候前ハ猶更疑念シ佛ハ果シテ「トリクー」氏ノ說ヲノミ採用スル歟ト程々推察致シ申候併シ其參リ掛リ等ハ直ニ得拜話頗ル安心致シ候都合ニテ有之申候

右條々無腹臆可致拙答トノ懇諭ニ付無遺漏達御聞候

拙電信貳箇ノ寫ハ固ヨリ當日森公使ヘモ致轉送置候處其節以電信云々御注意被下多謝々々其後同使トハ數回書信ヲ往復シ公務ノ打合せ等五ニ無腹臆致居候間萬端御掛念被下聞敷候

先ハ爲其草々不乙

十六年十月十八日

蜂須賀賢臺

周 藏

而シテ其終期ハ八年トスベシト在日本獨公使出タル由則此八年ノ終期トハ前顯コンデシヨシ付キノ終期ヲ申タルモノト相察候

第二、九月十七日附貴電信中日不國全開或ハ幾部分ヲ開クノ事ハ不定ノ疑問ナリトノ義ハ本邦開明ノ事業此上其歩ヲ進メ候得ハ右八年ノ期限前ニテモ日本國中ノ幾部分ヲ開キ現存領事裁判權ノ幾部分ヲ廢止スベシトノ事

尊臺ヘ獨政府ヨリ懇話有之候由依テ獨政府ノ各國ヘ差出候回章中不定ニ發議セシ事ニハ無之段敬承致シ候

右ノ通り小生ニ於テ貴諭ノ趣了解致候得共重要ノ件ニ付爲念今一應爰ニ相掲ケ候

偕又佛政府不好意思云々ノ義ニ付御申越ノ趣委曲敬承小生ニ於テ好意アリト御通知致シ候段ハ御確信ノ趣又不好意思アル由縁モ無之トノ御紙表ニテ安心致シ候此點ニ付テハ猶御掛念モ有之由御申越ニ候得共小生ニ於テハ貴君ノ塊伊等ハ御着手相成候ニ付一身上ノ不平ハ先日モ申進候通り毛頭無之唯々後日本邦ノ爲ヲ心配致候而已ニ御座候依テ御追書ニ井上外務卿ヘ云々辯明致シ候テハ如何ト御申越ニ候ヘ共今日小生ニ於テハ別段辯明致シ候ニハ不及ト相考申候

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三〇九

尙々昨日「シーボルト」氏ヨリ通信中「マルシヤル」氏ヨリ投シタル書帖ノ義ニ付種々云々申遣候全體事此ニ至候義ハ千萬遺憾ニ候御互往復中ニ生シタル云々特ニ貴君ノ御盡力ヲ羨視シ或ハ佛ノ好意ヲ不好意思ノ様取成候様御考有之候テハ於小生萬々不意ニ候間拙電信并機密信ニ照據シ都合次第賢臺ヨリ井上外務卿ヘ云々御辯明相成候テ如何左候ハ、御趣意并ニ佛政府ノ趣意モ確乎相分リ好都合ノ義ト存申候其際ニハ御用捨ナク拙電信及機密信ニ付「ラブセルブ」被成候テ不苦候

附屬書二

乙號 十六年十月二十六日附蜂須賀公使ヨリ青木公使宛内信

本月十八日附ノ貴書拜讀改正事件ニ付小生不明瞭ニ相考候件々委詳無御腹臆御示諭被下多謝ノ至奉存候

第一、獨政府ガ歐洲各國政府ヘ回章中發議セシ終期ノ意味ハ通商事項ノミナラズ條約全部ノ終期ヲ八年ト定メ其期ニ至リ日本ノコンデシヨシ全國ヲ開キ治外法權ヲ解キ得ルニ達シタレバ現存ノ條約ハ全ク功力ナキモノトナシ得ルトノ事ナリ御申越ノ如ク九月二十一日附我外務卿ヨリ御五ヘ當テタル電信中通商事項ハ他ノ事項ヨリ引離シテ締結スベシ

右條々ニテ御五間此上不明瞭ノ廉ハ無之ト存申候此如往復ヲ重ネ候モ全ク御同然憂國ノ情ヨリ起リ候事猶此後テ不明瞭ノ廉ハ御五ニ明瞭ニ相成候迄無腹臆藏往復致シ候方好結果ヲ得ルノ基ト相考申候

右貴答旁申進候間御都合ヨキ節御再答被下候ニ於テハ大幸可奉存候也

十六年十月二十六日

茂 詔

青木公使閣下

附屬書三

十六年十月二十三日附蜂須賀公使宛往電

Japanese Minister

Petersburg.

To Hachisuka. Shall answer your telegram of 15th ultimo by mail as it is too complicated to answer by wire; but I will add the following only for your personal information as strictly private, and not to be mentioned as my instruction until you receive the above despatch: The admission of foreigners into interior by extended system of pas-

sport is necessarily connected with the question of jurisdiction and deem it best to consider it at the same time with the latter. Therefore, as concession in its stead, we are not unprepared to open few ports and also to allow coasting trade under charter system for a limited period. As to coasting trade generally, our geographical position forbids to concede in entirety. (以下省略) Inouye.

三二〇 明治十年一月九日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
蜂須賀駐佛公使宛

## 獨逸政府ニ意見書提出ノ件

内信

蜂須賀公使宛

九月十九日發ノ貴簡致披閱候先、森青木ト會議ノ節始メハ御意見兩氏ト相違ノ廉モ有之候得共、後ニ至リ釋然御瞭解尙一層兩氏ト協同御盡力ノ趣承悉於拙官モ大ニ休神致候。一凡テ條約重修ノ件ニ關シ拙官ヨリ差立候電信及書簡等ハ可成森青木ヘモ御轉示隱諱セラル、事無之様致度要之自己

耳義政府ヘ對シテモ自分ノ考ニテハ其位ノ事ハ我政府ニテ承知致スナラントハ思ヘトモ如何ノ者ニヤト云フ使ノ語氣ニテ凡テ貴官一人ノ御見込トシテ曖昧ニ御話置相成候様致度此段以内信中進候也

十六年十一月九日

註 1234 夫々 III O II、III O III 附屬書一、I O A 附屬書  
及 III O 九附屬書三參照

三二一 明治十年十二月十日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
蜂須賀駐佛公使宛

## 條約改正ニ對スル佛國政府ノ態度ニ關スル件

内信

十月三日附尊翰落掌仕候、益御多祥御精勤奉欣然候。劣弟無事消光乍併當三月已來末子事臥床今以全快ニ不至又愚妻事モ爲病且柔弱ナル質故別デリケートニ相成フアミリノハツピー無之實ニ困難ヲ極メ中候御憐察被下度候。陳ハブルツセルヘ御會合ノ後森ヨリ少々疑心ヲ生ジ候由併シ更ニ意ニ介シ候事ハ於弟無御座候。御安心被下度候其節差出候電報後獨公使ト劣弟面晤ノ末我政府ヨリ他國政府エ可與コンセツシ

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三二一

一个ノ意見ヲ敢爲セントスルトキハ竟ニ相互ニ撞着ノ恐ヲ免レザル次第ニ付諸事協同熟議御從事相成度尤向後單ニ貴官一人ノ御心得迄ニ差立ル電信及書簡ハ其旨ヲ記載致様取計可申候ニ付右記入無之分ハ悉皆森青木ヘモ御示シ相成候方致希望候

重修一件ニ付不邦在留獨逸公使カウトン、デノーフ氏ト初度談判ノ提要ハ過日已ニ以電信申進候通ニ有之其後再度ノ談判ニ及ヒ内閣一同トモ協議ノ末遂ニ別紙ノ通英文ニテ我政府ノ意見書相認メ書簡相添同氏ヘ交附致置候。抑右ハ全ク獨逸政府ノ好意ニ起リシヲ以テ竟ニ右意見書ヲモ送致セシ場合ニ立到候義ニ付他日獨逸政府ヨリ右意見書ヲ各國政府ヘ相廻シ候節其國政府ニ於テ其儀ナレバ已ニ駐劄ノ公使ヨリ聞テ承知致居ルト申様ノ事有之候テハ獨逸公使ノ折角ノ好意モ徒然ニ歸シ且ツ此方ニテ獨逸政府ニ對シ右意見書ハ極々秘密ナリト申入置候詞モ他ニモ之ヲ承知スル者有之候テハ空言ト相成候義ニ付追テ獨逸政府ヨリ右意見書ヲ以テ各國政府ヘ廻達セシ事御確知ノ上ヲ待テ森青木兩公使トモ御協議ノ上外務卿ヨリ今度斯々内訓到來セリト御發言被成不苦候得共夫迄ノ處ハ去月二十三日附電信ニテ申進候如ク白

ヨンヲ申出候故是迄コンセツシヨシト相考候故少々困難ニ候得共前便申上候通ニ相決中候獨逸政府ニ於テ如何感觸シ候哉此末甚以懸念至極ニ御座候最早此上ハ如何様工夫ヲ盡候テモ内地通商坏切迫申來候得ハ程善ク相斷候テ先此上ハ現行條約ヲ守成シ兩三年間改正延引仕候外手段無之候實ニ劣弟ノボリシト不當リニテ甚面皮モ無之候得共如何センカノ不足事ユヘ國ノ迷惑ト悲歎ニ不堪又青木ヨリ兎角英佛反對論云々ハ既ニ來書モ有之少シク奇異ノ思ヲ生シ居候得共定テ老耄并ニマルシャル氏ノ盡力ニテムウブメントノ奏功ヲ未ダ能ク不知事ト愚考仕候就テハ弟エ機密信ニテ御送付相成候書類ヲ極密ニシテ寫壹通又至急青木ニ御送達被下度候。左候ハハ明瞭可相成事ト相信シ居候又於弟ハ如何様何人ヨリ申來候トモ近々ノ御來書ト又マルシャルノコンベルシエーションニテ佛政府ノ方向ヲ改メ候事又同人ト同外務大輔トノ談話等ニテ委曲承知仕居候間御安心被下度候。丈佛政府ノ少シク動キタルハトンキンアツフエアスニアラインスヲ不致トモフレンドリー局外中立位ハ望ミ度色氣ヨリ我改正事件ヘフエーボールヲ與エ候事ハ不容疑候ニ付其邊ハ屹度御注意有之度候又トンキン事件ラインスチユルメント

1011

ニシテ改正ノムーブメントヲ佛政府エ爲働候趣向御承知通リニ有之候併シ眞ニ佛ト同盟シテ清國ヘ戰爭ヲ吹懸ル手段又佛ヘフレンジー局外中立ヲナスノ見込ハ一點モ無之實ハ十九日附ノ電報則チ榎不公使ヨリノ分モ直ニ清國公使ヘモ參リ相示シ且トリク一清國ヨリ歸國懸ケ當時日本ヘ立寄間接ニガリーヲ以テ同盟ヲ促シ候得共更ニ不相應段等委曲清公使ヘ相話シ置同公使ハ大悅ノ色ヲ顯シ居申候トリク一ト談判書此次便ニ差出可申候

(中略)

又三公使協和同輒着手ハ當時別テ要用ニ候間深ク御注意ヲ仰キ申候青木ヨリハ老臺ノ事ハ餘程適當ナル人物能其職ヲ盡シ協和可出來人ナリト申越居候此段モ御心得迄申上置候書外ハ後鴻ニ讓候時下益々御自愛專一奉存候謹言

三二二 明治六年二月二十八日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 條件附有期結約問題ニ關スル件

拜啓諸ハ條約改正一條ニ付貴君ヨリ青木公使ヘ當テタル貴君在日本獨逸公使ヘ御返答云々貴電信寫青木氏ヨリ廻シ來

微恙ト存候

他事ハ公信機密信ニテ申上候ニ付此段計草々内啓

十六年十一月廿八日

マドリッド府ヨリ

茂 韶

馨賢臺閣下

註 1 三六六附屬書外務卿發青木公使宛往電  
2 三六九附屬書一青木公使發外務卿宛電信

三二三 明治十七年一月四日 マルシヤル氏ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 新任英國公使ト會議ノ件

附屬書 マルシヤル氏來信X號

Confidential

4 January 1884.

Monsieur le Ministre,

I left Lisbon ten days ago and came back to Paris to see Mr. Plunkett, who was then here.

Mr. Hachisuka asked me to write at once to your Excellency with the results of the interview and I beg to enclose a condensed report of those conver-

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三二三

リ引續キ森公使ヘノ貴電信同氏ヨリ寫到來全ク獨政府發議ノコンヂション付キノ終期御承諾相成候段拜承小生ハ兼々申進候通りノ持論故至極適當ノ御返答ト奉存候且又過ル九月廿四日并ニ本月廿五日落手致候貴電信ニ寄レハ外國人内地旅行一條ハ法律問題ニ關係有之何分今日獨白ノ申分御承諾難相成依テ其代リコンセスシヨントシテ二三ノ新港ヲ開ク事并ニ或ル年限中沿海貿易ヲ「チアールテルシステム」ニ倚リ許ス事等ハ御承諾ノ準備無キニシモ非ス趣委曲ハ本月九日附郵便ニテ貴書ト共ニ獨逸公使ヘ遣ハサレタルメモランダム御送被下候ニ付是ニテ篤ト拜承可致様御申越ノ義逐一總テ承諾致シ候

偕ニ昨廿六日青木公使ヨリ巴里我公使館ヲ經由シテ電報差越獨逸政府ヨリ同氏ヘ表向ノ通知ニハ英政府獨ノ發議スル終期ニ同意ヲ表スル趣報知アリシ由依テ速ニ我東京ニ於テ談判相創メ候事英獨兩政府共ニ希望スル趣申越小生ニ於テハ實ニ最好結果ト拍手雀躍不過之爲國家深ク所賀ニ御座候此次第ニヨレハ來年ハ必貴地ニ於テ談判ノ結局ヲ得ル事ト奉存候森氏ハ兼テ持論異リ候段内々申上候通りノ次第至極失望ノ様子仄ニ承知此節ハ少々不快ト承申候尤モラル上ノ

sations with Mr. Plunkett. They lasted, together, about eight hours, and almost every element of the position was discussed.

In order to avoid error the report has been agreed between Mr. Plunkett and myself, and Mr. Plunkett takes a copy of it.

I found Mr. Plunkett animated by what seemed to be a sincere desire to do all he can for Japan (consistently with his duties to England), and by a strong conviction that he has achieved wonders already in bringing England to the proposals contained in the Memorandum of 11 December. But, at the same time, he thinks that Japan ought to meet him half way and he was much disappointed at my opposition.

He asked me to write privately to Your Excellency to express his hope that he will be received with good-will and confidence in Japan and to say that his attitude will depend on the attitude adopted towards him. I told him that this was rather delicate, but that, still, I would write whatever he desired should be communicated confidentially to

Your Excellency, provided he read and approved my words beforehand; he accepted this condition and the result is the letter enclosed herewith, marked X: It is of course essential to give Your Excellency this explanation of the circumstances under which the letter X came to be written, but I venture to add that it is desirable Mr. Plunkett should not learn that I have mentioned those circumstances.

The general feeling left upon me by my interviews with Mr. Plunkett is that he is really convinced that England will not at present grant total terminability on the German conditions, but still I incline to the impression that it would not be impossible to bring England, with time, to agree to it, provided Germany and the other Powers maintain their present proposals unchanged. I may be wrong in this opinion, but I lay it before Your Excellency in the belief that it is correct. Mr. Plunkett has not *told* me anything of the kind, but I infer it from his manner and attitude.

I send copies of the conversation to Mr. Mori and Mr. Aoki.

obstacles which he has encountered in England, and I am sure he hopes that Your Excellency will think so too. He seems to be convinced that if he had not taken the side of Japan, as he has done, the result would have been far more unfavorable than it is, and I fancy he considers that the warm sympathy and support which he has shown to Japan in London justify him in expecting that he will find the same sympathy and support in Japan when he gets there.

I have told Mr. Plunkett that, so far as he is personally concerned, he may look forward with certainty, to a hearty welcome in Japan and to all the manifestations of esteem and trust which his character, his person and his manner arouse in everybody who approaches him. I have assured him that he will be received in Tokio with the warmest cordiality and with lively gratitude for his efforts to serve Japan.

But, at the same time, I have not concealed from him that, in my opinion, the testimonies of confidence and regard with which he will be greeted

I have the honour to be,  
Monsieur le Ministre,  
Your Excellency's most obedient servant,  
Frederick Marshall.

註 “condensed report of those conversations with  
Mr. Plunkett.” (原案ハ譯テナンキヤニ來信トシ

並國書

ハ譯 十廿廿一四四四ナンキヤニ來信ニ井上外務卿宛來信

Confidential

4 January 1884.

X.

Monsieur le Ministre,

I think Mr. Plunkett is desirous that Your Excellency should be made acquainted, privately, before he reaches Japan, with the double fact that peculiar difficulties, of various kinds, have stood in the way in London, and that he has made energetic efforts to overcome those difficulties in order to obtain better terms of revision for Japan.

Mr. Plunkett evidently feels strongly that he has acted as a friend of Japan in struggling against the

in Tokio will be a homage to his own qualities and merits alone and that they will not affect the action of the Japanese Government in its negotiations with England.

In reply to this Mr. Plunkett gave me to understand, rather distinctly, that his official attitude in Japan will be dependent on the manner in which he may be officially treated there, and that his personal disposition to be conciliatory and yielding will cease to influence him if the Japanese Government is not conciliatory and yielding also.

I have the honour to be,  
Monsieur le Ministre,  
Your Excellency's very obedient servant,  
Frederick Marshall.

三二四 明治十三年四月十五日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

法權回復及内地開放問題ニ對スル獨佛ノ態度ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十三年四月二十日發蜂須賀公使來電  
(條約改正事件ニ關シテ佛國政府ノ在本邦

## 二 同國公使宛訓令ニ關スル件

二十七年四月十六日附マルシヤル氏及レーン氏覺書

## 三 在東京佛國公使ヘノ訓令

四 十七年四月三十日附マルシヤル報告

獨露ノ亞細亞政策ト我條約改正問題ニ付報告ノ件

六月六日到

拜啓者ハ過ル十九日二通ノ電信進呈一ハ佛政府ノ我改正事件ニ付テノ同國在日本公使ヘノ訓令云々又一ハ小生ガ所見ヲ申上候處其翌々廿一日ニ至リ在獨青木同僚ヨリ書翰到來獨政府ハ昨年發議ノ主義ヲ飽迄モ固特シ英政府ノ申スプロベーションナル云々ニ不同意スル而已ナラズ八年ノ後歐各國満足ノ承諾ト共ニ日本法律ヲ以テ全國ヲ開キ得ベシトノ決意ヲ在日本獨公使迄訓令致シ遣シ候由此事ハ青木氏ヨリ電信ヲ呈シ且郵書ニテモ委布申上候事ト存候此青木氏ノ報知ハ小生白國ブラツセルス府ニテ同政府其筋ヨリ承リ候反對ニ出テ候事ニ御座候隨テ小生ヨリ相呈シ候本月七日附ノ電信ニ揭グル意味并前顯十九日附電信ニモ反對ヲ引起シ候ハ止ヲ不得モノニテ其節マデハ獨政府ノ斯ノ如キ意嚮ナル事

分一應ハ右ノ事情ニテ有リシナラン然ルニ過月即三月末ヨリ本月ニ至リ再ヒ昨夏ノ發議ヲ固守シ英ニ拘ラズ日本法律ニテ八年ノ後日本全國ヲ開ク事隨テ我條約ヲ其時ニ至リ日本政府ノ Denounce スル權ヲ與フル事マデ（尤歐各國ニテ前以テ understanding ヲ要スルトハ有之候）決意在日本獨公使ヘ訓令セシ事ト察セラレ候然ルニ此獨政府ノ我邦ノ爲メ十分ノ好意ヲ示セシハ唯一ト筋ニ我日本ヲ好ミスルノ主義ニハ有之間敷必故アル事ト存ラレ申候未ダ即今ニテハ確然タル事ハ申上難ク候得共此節ニ至リ露國ト獨國ハ俄ニ好友トナリ他歐各國ト共ニ英國ガ埃及事件ノ拙策ヲ責メ東洋ニ關スル政略ヲ計ル哉ノ風聞新聞紙上ニモ端々相見ヘ又或ル人ヨリ内話ニモ承リ候本邦ヘ獨政府ガ好意ヲ示スモ或ハ此邊ニ起因セルモノニハ有之間敷哉ト考ヘラレ即今ニテハ何分全ク眞確ト保シ難ク候得共右ハ中ラズトモ遠カラザル原因ト推察シ申候尤英ト大陸各國トノ間ニ於テ決テ大ナル争ヒヲ生ズル如キハ萬々有之間敷候得共畢竟英政府ハ止ムヲ得ズ政略ヲ改ムルニ可至歟唯傳聞ノ儘ヲ申上候佛政府ハ一旦ハ英政府ニ同意シ我改正事件ニ付英ト大同小異ノ訓令ヲ在日本佛公使與ヘ候段ハ過ル十九日附電信ヲ以テ申

ヲ更ニ存知致サマリシ事ニ御座候獨政府ノ意嚮ハ豫テ每度申上候小生ノ望ム所ニ有之歐各國ハ多分獨ニ同意ヲ表スル事ニ至リ可申尤貴地在留英獨兩公使ノ商議ニ不満足無之答ハ勿論ナガラ其談決ノ如何ニ寄り大關係有之様被存候尤過ル十九日相呈シ候電信一通ノ方小生所見ハ何卒篤ト其意味ヲ御研究御熟考被下度隨テ爰ニマルシヤル氏レーン氏兩名ノ覺書ヲ封入相呈シ申候此マルシヤル氏レーン氏兩名連署覺書出來ノ譯ハ森公使當地出發前右兩氏ノ面會前途從事ノ爲メ必要ナル事ヲ小生ヘモ話有之依テ在英我臨時代理公使大山氏ト相談ノ上本月中旬レーン氏當巴府ニ來リマルシヤル氏ト種々懇談ノ末右覺書出來致シ候事ニ御座候獨政府即今ノ意嚮ハ青木氏ヨリ前顯ノ如ク承リ候ノミナラズ當佛外務省中ノ或ル人ヨリモ承リ込候事有之且極密ナガラ即今當佛國在留獨國大使館ニ等書記官グーツシミツド氏（此人本邦ニ先年中在勤御同様能ク承知ノ人也）ヨリモ小生ヘ内話有之青木氏ノ報知ト全ク符合致シ候尤獨政府ハ昨夏發議已來變節セシ證據ハ無之候得共舊臘十一日附ノ英メモラシムニ付テハ餘程小首ヲ傾ケ殆ンド英ニ同意ヲ表スルノ場合ニ至リシ哉ニモ相聞ヘ素ヨリ此事雖然ニハ無之候得共多

上候通りニ有之是ハ佛外務省商務局長クラブレーン氏ヨリ内密マルシヤル氏迄送リ來候書翰中ニ其訓令三ヶ條大意ヲ掲ゲ有之依テ右寫是又爰ニ封入（英譯文トモ）相呈シ候扱此訓令ヲ當佛政府ヨリ出シ候ハ過ル三月十四日ノ便ニ有之依テ最早此六七日間ニハ在日本佛公使落手相成候事ト存候乍去青木同僚ヨリ申越候ニハ過日同氏ヨリ獨政府ヘ促シ候上獨政府ハ此節貴地ニテ改正事件萬般商議スル權ヲ與フル旨在日本獨公使ヘ電信致シ候由ニ有之依テ一昨廿三日當佛外務卿ニ小生面會ノ上同様ノ電信ヲ在日本佛公使ヘ電信有之度旨申入候處早速承諾即夕電信ヲ出シタル由ニ承リ申候尤佛政府ハ右ノ如ク一旦英ト大同小異ノ訓令ヲ（但シ此訓令ハ或ハ極メテ内訓ナル哉モ難計）在日本同公使ヘ遣シ候ニ拘ラズ此節聞知シタル獨政府ノ前段ニ掲クル如キ意嚮ニ付猶又再考中ニ相見ヘ其故ハ青木ヨリ承ル處并ニ當地獨大使館等ヨリ内聞スル所ニテモ獨ヨリ佛ニ同意ヲ促シ候哉ニ有之多分ハ獨ニ同意シ再ヒ在日本佛公使ヘ訓令ヲ遣シ候哉モ難計景況ニ有之候尤前段ニモ申述候獨露兩國合體云々東洋關係ノ政策云々等モ佛今日ハ能ク聞知シ此點ニ付テハ獨露ト共ニスルノ意ナルベキ歟ト察セラレ隨テ日本ノ事モ獨ニ

大體ハ同意スル方近カラン哉ト眞ノ推察ナガラ相考申候鬼モ角モ獨政府ノ決意ハ我邦ニ取り好結果ヲ可得相考候ニ付可成タケ英在日本公使ニ折合ヲ付ケ此機ヲ失ハズ満足ノ御結約希望ニ不堪奉存候猶佛政府ノ模様ハ次便迄ニ今一層委曲申上候種可生哉ト望ミ居中候

白耳義西班牙葡萄牙瑞西四政府ヘモ追々貴電信ニ應シ在日本各國公使輩ヘ訓令有之度申入方了箇中ニ御座候

諸別紙マルシヤル、レーン兩氏ノ覺書ハ其大體主義ハ小生ニ於テ同意ニ有之開國ノ事條約上ニ掲グル時ハ自縛ノ患免レ難キ歟後年之ヲ實行スル時ニ臨ミ何ニ付ケ歐各國ニ相談セザレハ行ヒ難キ弊ヲ生ズベキ恐レ有之且日本法律モ開國ノ時期ニ臨ミ確定セシモノニ各國同意ヲ表シ各國人我法律ニ從フニ至ルモ後年我ニ於テ法律ノ修正改良等ヲ要スル時其時々各國政府ノ承諾ヲ得ザレバ改メ難キ患難ヲ引起スノ基トナル哉モ難計元來開國立法ハ全く不邦政府ノ隨意ニ做シ得ベキモノニテ條約ニ開國ノ期限ヲ設ケ法律ノ完全不完全ニヨリ外國政府ニ於テ左右スルガ如キ性質ヲ帶ビタル條款ヲ掲グル等ハ甚好マザルモノニ有之一ニ卑屈ニ均シク一ニハ主客ヲ違フルニ均シキノ嫌ヒ免レザルモノト存候開國

ニ付レーン意見書今便御手許ヘ差出シ候事ト存候是ハ已前マルシヤル意見書ト御照考被下度レーン氏ハ英ニ在リテ英ノミヲ知り他各國ヲ詳ニセザルヨリ聊偏見ヲ免レザル哉ト存シ又マルシヤルハ或ハ外交政略ニハ疎濶ナル氣味有之聊拙ヲ免レザル哉宜御折衷肝要奉存候尤大體ハ小生ニ於テマルシヤルノ意見ニ同意御座候也

註 1「過ル十九日二通ノ電信」ノ内一通ハ附屬書一

來電、他ノ一通ハ見當ラズ

2「本月七日附ノ電信」ナルモノ見當ラズ

#### 附屬書一

十七年四月二十日發蜂須賀駐佛公使來電

(條約改正事件ニツイテ佛國政府ノ在本邦同國公使宛訓令ニ關スル件)

佛國政府ハ在日本佛公使ニ訓令ヲ送付シタル事ヲ内密ニ探知シタリ大略左ノ如シ

佛國政府ハ稅目及ヒ東京豫議會ニ於テ討論シタル各種ノ小事件ヲ約定スル所ノ通商條約ヲ締結スル事ヲ承諾スヘシ日本政府ハ十ヶ年ノ申此通商條約ヲ廢棄スルノ權ヲ有スヘシ但シ其前三ヶ年間満足ニ日本全國ヲ開キ置カサル可カラ

ハ純粹本邦政府ノ決意ヲ以テ今日ヨリ開クナリトモ本年ヨリ開クナリトモ來年ヨリ開クナリトモ

勸意ヲ以テ御布告相成ル事最良策ト相考而シテ内國居住ヲ欲スル外國人其他商業ヲ成ス事ヨリ萬般不邦法律ニ隨從サヘスレハ此御布告後ハ其後ノ在日本公使ノ許可ヲ經テ隨意ニナシ得ラルベク我法律ニ從フヲ欲セザル者ハ其自由ノ權ヲ持タズ内地ニ入ルヲ得ザル而已ノ事ト相成可申是レ後來我ニ取り患難ナキヲ計ル至當ノ策ト相信シ候乍去即今獨政府ノ意嚮ノ如キハ全ク條約全部ヲ八年ノ後ハ廢止シ得ベシ而シテ日本法律ヲ以テ開國シ得ベシトノ意ナルヲ以テ是ニ本邦政府御同意他各國モ異議ナク終ニ御結約相成レトノ事ニ候得ハ假令開國ノ事條約ニ掲グルモ患ヒ無キ事ト可相成乍去前後宜御照考我レヲ自縛スル如キ患無之條約上御注意ノ最要點ト存候ニ付愚存ヲ不顧申上候拙文意ヲ盡サズ宜御推考御考慮ノ程希願ニ不堪候也

十七年四月廿五日 巴府ヨリ

茂 韶 百 拜

外務卿閣下

猶々在英我臨時代理公使大山ヨリ我公館組織配置等ノ事

全國ヲ開キタル時ニ要用ナル司法及行政上ノ結構ハ次回ノ會議ニ於テ論定シ別條約ニ掲載スヘシ此別條約ノ終期ハ右司法及行政上ノ結構ヲ確定シタル後ニ於テ議スヘシ最惠國條款ニ付テハ其主義ヲ維持スヘシ然シナカラ佛國ハ右ニ關スル獨逸ノ提議ヲ勘考スル事ヲ拒マサルヘシ難破船ニ關スル日本ノ發議ニハ充分ニ同意スヘシ

生絲ニ課スル輸出稅ヲ廢シ文學及工業上ノ所有權ヲ保護スヘキ方法ヲ定メサル可カラズ

一千八百八十四年四月廿日發

#### 附屬書二

十七年四月十六日附マルシヤル氏及レーン氏覺書

Paris, 16 April 1884.

Memorandum on the conditions under which Japan should be opened to foreigners.

The European Governments appear to have decided together that the opening of the whole of Japan to foreigners shall be, in some form, a condition of the revision of the treaties. They do not ask that the opening shall take place immediately; on the contrary they seem to point to eight or ten years

hence as the period at which it shall be effected; but they claim that the Japanese Government shall bind itself, under treaty, to open the country at a fixed date and they assume the right of examining and approving the conditions of administration and legislation to which foreigners would be subjected in the interior.

We do not know (in Europe) whether the Japanese Government has, in the course of negotiations, given the foreign representatives in Tokio to understand or to suppose that it admits, wholly or partially, the right of foreign Powers to approve that administration and legislation. We do not know whether, from what may have happened in Japan, the Japanese Government is free or not free, to refuse that right to foreign Powers.

But we do know that the present treaties leave Japan free on the question; that they impose on her no engagements with respect to the opening of the country; that, so far as the present treaties go, she is at liberty to deal with it as she likes, and to take the initiative about it, if she so pleases,

according to her own views and without consulting any foreign Government.

If, therefore, the communications which have passed in Japan have not modified the situation created by the present treaties, Japan is in no way bound to make *a treaty engagement* on the question or to voluntarily encumber herself, for an indefinite future, with another engagement of such gravity.

Why should she not, on the contrary, reserve for her own action alone the arrangement of this question of opening the country? Why should she not settle its conditions by her own laws, as is done in every country in Europe, excepting Turkey?

If she did so the Powers might complain, but what *rights* have they in the matter? None—unless moral obligations have been tacitly accepted towards them during the recent negotiations which entitle them to say that Japan has already consented to grant them such rights.

As they have no such rights by the present treaties their object clearly is to acquire them in the revised treaty by pressing Japan to include them

therein. The object of Japan should be to prevent them from acquiring those rights and to retain in her own hands exclusively the entire control of the question in all its parts. It is on the supposition and in the hope that such rights have *not* been tacitly yielded up to them by the tone and character of the negotiations, that this memorandum is prepared.

If Japan is free why should she not declare that it is her intention *not* to deal with the question by treaty, but to regulate it, in every detail, by a Decree of the Emperor?

Of course, on such a subject, an Imperial Decree would bind Japan *morally* towards foreigners as completely as a treaty would bind her, and the terms of such a Decree could not be altered afterwards without very decisive motives. But the opening of Japan by Decree, on condition that all foreigners entering the interior are submitted to Japanese jurisdiction, would be a purely Japanese act, performed by the Emperor in the fullness of his power and rights, and the engagements created

by it, solemn though they would be, would present a very different character from those which would result from an international convention, and would place Japan in a very different situation of present and future independence before the world. She would follow the examples and adopt the precedents supplied by European countries, in which the abolition of Alien Acts has not been made a subject of treaty arrangements.

The opening of the country is decided, in principle, by Japan herself; it is for Japan herself to decide also the time and the form. If she did so, by Imperial Decree or some similar procedure, her position before the world would gain largely. She would no longer be exposed to the reproach of keeping herself closed; she would have decided and regulated the opening *on her own conditions*, and she would have kept herself clear of further treaty engagements.

As to the working out of such a Decree it may safely be predicted that, though foreign governments would probably object at first, certain of



Frederick Marshall  
R. Stuart Lane.

附屬書三

Frederick Marshall  
R. Stuart Lane.

2. Dénonciation possible de cet arrangement après une période de 10 ans, avec clause de tacite reconduction et sous réserve de la mise à exécution préalable et satisfaisante depuis 3 ans, du second arrangement à intervenir sur les questions liées à celle de l'ouverture du Japon au commerce étranger.

3. Décision relative à la fixation de la durée de ce second arrangement, ajournée jusqu'au moment où la conférence qui doit se réunir de nouveau à Tokio, aura réglé les questions d'ordre judiciaire et administratif que soulève l'ouverture du pays ;

any extension of Russia in Europe, adding, however, that Germany will look on without disapproval at the conquests or annexations of territory which Russia may effect in Asia.

It is believed that Germany has been led by four considerations to propose this policy to Russia. The first that she intends to resist all development of Slav influences in Europe, as contrary to German interests and power.

The second, that she wishes to reserve European Turkey for Austria, in order to obtain for herself, as a set-off, a part of the German provinces of Austria.

十七年四月三十日附マルシャル氏報告

(獨、露ノ亞細亞政策ト我條約改正問題ニ付報告ノ件)

The third, that she desires to create political difficulties for England in Asia, and to profit by them to extend German trade in Asia at the expense of England.

Paris, 30 April 1884.

The fourth, to take precautions against the possible consequences to Germany of a revolution in Russia, by directing the national action of Russia, beforehand, towards Asia alone, and away from Europe. For some years Russia resisted these proposals,

and the relations between Russia and Germany remained cold. But those relations had grown warmer of late and, towards the end of March 1884, Russia at last accepted the German offer. It is said, confidentially, that the essential object of the arrangement is to substitute Russia for England in Asia, Russia cordially abandoning her old designs upon Constantinople and accepting, in their place, the convenience of Germany and Austria at the indefinite extension of Russia in Asia. Germany is to find her own advantage, as has just been observed, in the development of her commerce with Asia which is expected to ensue from the hoped for diminution of English influence there.

The first effect of this understanding between Germany and Russia is understood to be that those two Powers and Austria are expressing to England disapprobation of her action in Egypt.

Another effect, directly concerning Japan, appears also to have been produced by the recent arrangement. It was generally supposed, at the end of March, that Germany was going to accept,

fit in with the arrangements between Germany and Russia and also with the general policy of Germany which forms one whole and of which every detail is made to serve all the rest. The Japanese revision is being used by Germany as an occasion of opposition to England in favor of Russia, politically, and of Germany herself, commercially.

Note, such is the explanation given, in the strictest confidence, by a member of the French Foreign Office, of the present action of Germany. As a rule all statements from French sources with regard to Germany should be regarded with mistrust; but in this case since the statement was made, a good deal of proof has been obtained elsewhere, and of its accuracy in many details has also been furnished by the newspapers, and for that reason, the influences as to the German motives towards Japan merit more attention than they would deserve under ordinary circumstances.

棚外ニ於ケル蜂 英獨兩政府之説異ナル如ク見ユレトモ其須賀公使ノ註

意嚮ハ殆ト同一ニ歸センカ但獨政府ノ發議最明白ナレバ我取ルヘキモノト考ム

in principle, the English basis of revision for the Japanese treaties, and it is probable that she really would have done so if Russia had continued to refuse the arrangement proposed to her by Germany. Instead of that, Germany has suddenly decided, simultaneously with the conclusion of her understanding with Russia, not to adhere to the English basis, but to assume the attitude of a friend of Japan. It is suspected that her object, in thus acting is to make more difficulties in Asia for England and also to serve the territorial projects of Russia by taking up a position for Japan against England, which will give her a justification hereafter for asking Japan, as the price of the service so rendered, to make no objection to the seizure of Corea by Russia.

The present sudden action of Germany as regards the revision is directed, according to this view, not by any real sympathy or good-will to Japan but by the objects and necessities of her general policy, in which, for the moment, Japan happens to occupy a place. The Japanese revision is made to

茂部

三二五 明治十三年三月十日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ井上外務卿宛

### 絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

拜啓陳ハ絹輸出税廢止ノ義當佛政府ヨリ發議候ニ付過日來電信御往復ヲ相重ネ候事ニ御座候處右ハ佛政府ニテ發議ヲ差引ト否トハ條約重修ニ付キ歐米各國ハ本邦ヨリ與フヘキ讓與ノ條款ニ寄リ候事ニテ其讓與ノ條款ヲ知ラスシテハ何トモ決答難致趣佛外務省商務局長ヨリ過日小官ハ直話有之候事ニ御座候其口氣ニ寄リ推察スルニ決テ佛政府ニ於テ飽迄モ右絹輸出税廢止ノ發議ヲ確守スルノ意ナキハ判然ニ有之依テ何ト歟色ヲ付候得ハ必我カ望ヲ承諾可致考ニ御座候電報ニテハ其意ヲ盡シ兼候哉トモ存候ニ付爰ニ一言申上置候宜御汲察御高慮ノ程希望ニ不堪奉存候右佛政府ノ意ハ我ヨリ各國ニ讓與スル條款中佛國ノ爲メ得ル所アリト認定候得ハ絹輸出税廢止ノ事ハ差引キテモ不苦トノ意ト察セラレ申候依テ唯一筋ニ右發議差引キ異候様申述候テハ却テ之ニ代ルモノナシトノ考慮ヨリ益確守スルノ患ヲ招クヘキ哉ト

甚タ相恐レ申候吳々御賢察奉仰望候

十七年七月十日

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

註 1 後出三一八附屬書一及二ノ七月一日附并ニ七月十日  
附電信以外往復ノ電信見當ラズ

三二六 明治十七年七月十八日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

拜啓絹輸出税一條ニ付過ル七日呈書以來御返電相受依テ右  
御訓令ニ遵ヒ過ル十六日（則水曜日外務省請日）外務卿ニ  
面會第一ニ右發議全ク取消ノ義請求申入候處外務卿ヨリ前  
便ニモ申上候通ノ理由ニテ他ニ之ニ代ル讓與ノ點ヲ見出ス  
迄ノ間ハ全ク取消シ難キ旨返答有之依テ小官ヨリ御電令中  
御申越ノ通兎モ角即今右發議取消シ猶近々議會開設ノ上若  
シ他各國ヨリモ税目ノ義ニ付讓與ノ請求發議有之如キ景況  
ニ至ラハ其節ハ更ニ佛國ノ動議トシテ發議相成ルトモ佛政  
府ノ考慮次第ニ有之趣意申入候後外務卿委曲其趣意了解ノ

趣返答有之且我ヨリ右請求ノ理由ハ何ノ點ニ有之哉トノ尋  
問有之候ニ付小官ヨリ右ハ他ノ理由ニ無之税目ノ部分ニ限  
リテハ他歐米各國ニ於テ我カ發議ノ税目ニ付今日迄一ノ修  
正說或ハ請求等無之然ルニ佛政府ニ於テ右絹輸出税廢止ノ  
事ヲ此上主張相成ル時ハ税目全部ニ影響ヲ生スルハ必定ニ  
テ其爲メ決定ノ税目ニ狂ヒヲ生スルノ恐有之又他各國ヨリ  
モ各請求修正ノ說等起リ候哉モ難計然ル時ハ今日殆ト決定  
セントスル税目又再查ヲ要スル事ト相成結約ノ期限モ隨テ  
延引スルノ恐有之故萬一全ク佛政府ニ於テ此發議ヲ取消シ  
難ク候得ハ今日ノ處ニテモ速ニ取消シ猶議會開設ノ上前段  
ニ申述ル如ク景況ニ寄リ再發行相成候テモ不苦段申入候處  
外務卿篤ト其理由了解ノ趣ニテ然ラハ兎モ角モ右佛國ノ請  
求ハ議會開設迄ハ取消シ可申乍去議會開設ノ上萬一日本ヨ  
リ歐米各國與フル讓與ノ條款中ニ付佛國ニ取り得タル所最  
乏キト見込時ハ或ハ再ヒ此請求ヲ發議スル哉モ難計是ハ佛  
國ノ自由ニ任セ吳度旨乍去是ハ全ク萬一ノ時ヲ慮リテ今日  
ヨリ申置候モノニテ絹輸出税廢止ノ事ハ日本政府ニ於テ之  
ヲ欲セスト承ル上ハ可成丈議會開設ノ上ハ他讓與ノ點ヲ見  
出シ此請求ハ再發議セサル様日本ノ都合ヲ計ルヘクトノ返

附屬書 七月十六日佛國外務卿談話書

佛國外務卿フエレー氏トノ談話書送付ノ件

拜啓過ル十八日附呈書中申上候小官ト佛外務卿フエレー氏  
トノ談話書別紙呈進候也

十七年七月廿五日

巴府ニテ

茂 韶

外務卿閣下

（追書省略）

註 1 前掲三一六文書

附屬書

十七年七月十六日佛國外務卿談話書譯文

蜂須賀公使佛國外務卿「ジュル、フエリ」氏トノ談話  
（千八百八十四年七月十六日巴里ニ於テ）

公使「グラヴリー」氏ハ閣下ニ絹糸輸出税廢止ノ事ニ付御  
話シ申セシカ

フエリ氏 ハイ、話シ致セシナリ

公使 猶拙者ヨリ御話シ仕リテ可然ヤ

フエリ氏 ハイ、何卒御話シアリタシ

公使 條約改正ノ事ニ付貴政府ニ於テ一般ニ御厚意ヲ表シ

（後略）

答ニ有之候其語氣頗ル款心ヲ相顯シタル體ニ相見候依テ小  
官ヨリ其早速承諾ノ好意ヲ謝シ猶然ルニ於テハ一兩日中在  
日本佛公使シエンキザイツ氏ハ電報ヲ以外務卿ヨリ訓令ヲ  
發シ吳可申裁相尋候處外務卿委曲承知一兩日中電令ヲ發ス  
ヘキ旨返答有之依テ小官ヨリ今日ノ御談話ハ直チニ電報ヲ  
以テ貴君ヘ可申進旨申入退席致シ候依テ右ニ掲クル大意昨  
十七日電報ヲ以テ申上候寫ハ當便公信ニテ御手許ヘ差出候  
先以御申越ノ御趣意ニ大體違ハサル様談判相整候ニ付是ニ  
テ御満足ヲ希望致シ候而已ニ御座候

十七年七月十八日

巴府ヨリ

茂 韶 頓首拜

外務卿閣下

註 1 「七日」ハ「十日」ノ誤カ、前掲三一五文書参照  
2 「十七日」ノ電報「見當ラズ」

三二七 明治十七年七月二十五日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

（絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル）佛國外務卿談話書送付ノ件

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三二七

被下サルル事ニ付テハ我政府ニ於テ甚タ満足致シ居ルナリ併シ我政府ニ於テハ「シエンキウイツ」氏ヨリ申出ラレタル絹糸輸出税廢止ノ議ハ拋棄セラレン事ヲ切ニ希望致スナリ其故ハ歐洲ノ諸政府ハ少シモ變更ヲ加ヘスシテ税目ヲ承諾セントスルナリ然ルニ貴政府ニ於テ右議ヲ主張セラル、ニ於テハ日本政府困却致ス可ク且之レノミナラス他諸政府ニ於テモ同様ノ事ヲ爲シ得可キカ故ニ到底一致合議ヲ得ル能ハサラン事ヲ大ニ恐ル、ナリ

フェリ氏 拙者ノ方ヨリ此議ヲ提出シタルハ驚ク可キ事ニハ之レナク其故ハ絹糸ハ重要ノ原質物ニシテ其税額ノ高低ハ我カ大工業ノ一項タル物件ノ高價ヲ生スヘケレハナリ

公使 拙者ノ領收シタル電信ノ訓令中ニ又左ノ事ヲ記載シアリタリ即チ

「若シ佛政府ニ於テ右議ヲ全ク拋棄スル事能ハサルトキハ閣下ハ先ツ會議ノ開ケタルマテ右議ヲ拋棄セシメラレタシ一段會議ノ開ケタルニ於テハ他ノ全權者ヨリモ諸議ヲ提出ス可ク此際ニ當テ右議ヲ申出ラレ

ヤ左ノ文言トハ

「絹糸輸出税廢止ノ議ハ會議ニテ取戻ス可シ一段會議ノ開ケタルニ於テハ他ニ其議ニ代ル可キ事ヲ見出ス可シ若シ之ヲ見出サハルトキハ佛國ノ代理者ハ時宜ニ依テ絹糸輸出税廢止ノ議ヲ提出ス可シ」

トノ事はナリ

フェリ氏 ハイ、左様致ス可シ

公使 閣下若シ商事ノ區域内他ノ議ニ於テ絹糸輸出税廢止ノ議ニ代ル可キ事之レアラハ日本政府ノ申分通り致シ被下ル、カ

フェリ氏 ハイ、勿論左様致ス可シ

公使 閣下ヨリ訓令ヲ御送り之レナキ前ニ拙者ヨリ我政府ニ閣下ノ御厚意ノ段ヲ電信ニテ申遣シテ可然ヤ將タ閣下ヨリ直ニ電信ニテ訓令ヲ御送り可被下ヤ如何  
フェリ氏 直ニ拙者ヨリ左様致ス可シ

右ニテ終リ

(右原文)

Conversation entre M. Hachisuka, Ministre  
du Japon et M. Jules Ferry, Ministre des

タルニ於テハ日本政府ニ於テ又之ヲ協議スヘシ」

フェリ氏 拙者ニ於テハ若シ他ニ右議事ニ代ル可キ事之レアルニ於テハ右議ハ拋棄致シ得ルナラン併シ今日ヨリ之ヲ確約スル事能ハサルナリ其拋棄ノ有無ハ其之ニ代ル可キ件ト殊ニ會議ノ如何ニ依テ決セサル可カラス拙者ハ閣下ノ望マル、通り致ス可シ併シ何故ニ貴方ニ於テハ右議ニ固着セラル、ヤ

公使 我政府ノ大ニ之ニ固着スル所以ハ税目ニ於テ變更ヲ受クル事ヲ避クルカ爲メナリ拙者ノ勸考スル所ニテハ閣下ノ御考次第ニテ「シエンキウイツ」氏ハ右議ヲ拋棄ス可シ一段會議開ケタル上ニテ我政府各國一般ニ與フル所ノモノ佛國ヲ満足セシムル事能ハサルニ於テハ他ニ又之ヲ満足セシムル事アラン事ハ拙者ノ確信スル所ナリ則チ右議ヲ提出スル事モ出來ルナリ何レニ致セ我政府ニ於テハ會議前ニ右議ヲ主持セラレサル事ヲ切望スルナリ

フェリ氏 了解致シタリ拙者ハ御望ノ通り致ス可シ

公使 閣下ハ電報ヲ以テ左ノ文言ヲ記シタル改正訓令ヲ「シエンキウイツ」氏ニ御送り被下ル、事ヲ得サル

Affaires Etrangères de France.

Paris, le 16 juillet 1884.

M. Hachisuka. M. Clavery a-t-il parlé à Votre Excellence de la question de l'abolition du droit d'exportation de la soie ?

M. Jules Ferry. Oui, il m'en a parlé.

M. Hachisuka. Votre Excellence voudra-t-il que je répète.

M. Jules Ferry. Oui, s'il vous plaît.

M. Hachisuka. Mon Gouvernement est très satisfait de la bonne disposition générale du Gouvernement Français pour la révision des traités. Mais mon Gouvernement désire vivement que la proposition de M. Sienkewitz demandant l'abolition du droit d'exportation de la soie soit *renoncée*; tous les gouvernements de l'Europe sont *disposés à agréer* le tarif sans aucune altération. Si cette proposition est soutenue, le Gouvernement Japonais serait embarrassé et craindrait beaucoup que l'accord ne pourra plus se faire, les autres pays pouvant faire la même chose.

M. Jules Ferry. Il n'est cependant pas étonnant

que nous avions formulé cette demande, la soie étant une matière première importante et ses droits pouvant causer le renchérissement de l'article qui est notre grande industrie.

M. Hachisuka. Dans l'instruction télégraphique j'ai reçu, il est aussi dit: "dans le cas que le Gouvernement Français ne pourra pas complètement abandonner la question, que Votre Excellence veuille bien faire *renoncer* la question au moins jusqu'à la conférence; une fois la conférence ouverte les autres plénipotentiaires pourront faire des propositions, et si dans cette occasion la question sera soulevée, le Gouvernement Japonais la prendra en considération."

M. Jules Ferry. Si nous trouvons *un équivalent* sous une forme quelconque, on pourroit renoncer; mais nous ne pouvons pas nous lier dès maintenant; cela dépendra de l'équivalent et surtout de la conférence; je pourrai faire comme vous demandez; mais pourquoi tenez vous tant à cette question?

M. Hachisuka. Mon Gouvernement y tient énor-

mément pour éviter des altérations dans le tarif; à mon avis personnel, si vous voulez bien, M. Sienkiewicz renoncera à la question; et une fois la conférence ouverte si les concessions générales ne satisfont pas la France, je suis sûr qu'il y en aura un avantage de toute façon, on pourrait soulever la question; de toute façon mon Gouvernement tient à ce que la question ne soit pas maintenue au moins avant même la conférence.

M. Jules Ferry. Je comprends; je pourrai faire cela.

M. Hachisuka. Votre Excellence voudra-t-elle bien envoyer une instruction modifiée par *télégraphe* à M. Sienkiewicz disant que "la question sera retirée jusqu'à la conférence et une fois la conférence ouverte on tâchera de trouver un équivalent sous une forme quelconque; et dans le cas qu'on ne le trouverait pas le représentant de la France verra s'il y a lieu de soulever la question."

M. Jules Ferry. Oui, je ferai cela.

M. Hachisuka. Si vous trouvez un équivalent dans d'autres *vuestions* dans l'*ordre commercial*,

vous ne demanderez pas mieux de contenter le Gouvernement Japonais.

M. Jules Ferry. Oui, parfaitement.

M. Hachisuka. Votre Excellence trouverait-t-elle mieux que je télégraphie d'abord Votre bienveillante disposition à mon gouvernement avant que Votre Excellence n'envoie Votre instruction; ou si Votre Excellence veut l'envoyer dès maintenant par télégraphe.

M. Jules Ferry. Je le ferai dès maintenant.

fin.

三十一 明治十七年七月十三日

井上外務卿ヨリ  
蜂須賀駐佛公使宛

### 絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

#### 附屬書一

十七年七月一日發蜂須賀公使宛往電  
(絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件)

- 二 十七年七月十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電
- 三 十七年八月十一日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

機密信 第廿七號

蜂須賀全權公使殿

井上外務卿

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三十八

一〇三一

七月十八日并廿五日ノ内信接到條約改正事件ニ付其國外務卿ニ御面會相成絹類輸出税廢止ノ要求ニ對シ御抗論ノ顛末逐一領悉御配慮ノ段深察致候然處七月十八日ノ貴信ニ據レハ貴官ニハ同卿ニ對シ若シ佛國ニテ右廢税ノ要求ヲ拋棄セサル時ハ他各國ヨリモ請求修正ノ說等起リ候哉モ難計旨演述被成候趣又同月廿五日ノ貴信ヲ見レハ佛政府ニ於テ右議ヲ全ク拋棄スル事能ハサルトキハ先ツ會議ノ開クルマテ之ヲ拋棄セシメラレ度旨御請求相成候趣ニ有之候  
元來我政府ニ於テ各國ヲシテ豫議會擬定ノ税目ヲ其儘採用セシメントスルハ先般差進候覺書中ニモ記載有之通元是税目ハ各國ノ利益ヲ調合シ各自ノ讓與ヲ以テ僅ニ協同ヲ得タル者ナレハ若シ其一部ヲ動ス時ハ忽チ全體ニ差響キ更ニ許多ノ時日ト勞力ヲ費スニアラサレハ其完結ヲ得難キ故ニ有之候又輸入税ノミ獨リ然ルニアラス輸出税モ亦預議會ニ於テ從前實施ノ通り之ヲ動カササル事ニ發議致置候ニ付テハ矢張其一部ヲ動カス時ハ其弊害ハ輸入税ヲ變換スルト敢テ異ナル所ナギ次第ニ有之候加之今般條約改正ノ主眼トスル所ハ第一ニハ輸入税額ヲ増加シ第二ニハ其報酬トシテ新港増設及其他ノ讓與ヲ爲シ以テ多少裁判權ヲ收復シ治外法權

ヲ漸廢スルニ至ルノ初歩ヲ得ル爲ナリ故ニ輸出ト輸入トヲ論セス其一部タリトモ之ヲ變換スル時ハ其影響他ノ我ニ讓與スヘキ廉ニモ連及シ遂ニ條約改正ノ基礎ヲ破却シテ凡テ新ニ談論ヲ起スノ場合ニ至ラサルヲ不得故ニ右ハ是非共之ヲ變換セス輸入税ニ付テハ預議會擬定ノ税目ヲ採用セシメ輸出税ハ従前ノ通りニナシ置且之ヲ増減又ハ廢止スルノ自由ヲ我政府ニ存シ置候事緊要ニ有之候

然ル處英國及獨逸ノ兩政府ニ於テハ當地在留ノ公使ニ附與セル訓令中若シ他ノ政府ヨリ預議會擬定ノ税額ニ付變換又ハ修正ノ議ヲ提出スル時ハ同様ノ議ヲ換起スルノ權ヲ保有セシムヘキ旨記載有之候ニ付テハ開議前タリトモ又開議中タリトモ佛國ヨリ絹類輸出税廢止ノ議ヲ提出スル時ハ英獨兩國ハ申スニ及ハス他ノ各國ヨリモ同様ノ議題ヲ論出スルニ至ルハ必然ニ有之候依之拙者ハ佛國ヲシテ全ク右廢税ノ議ヲ拋棄セシメ度本旨ニ有之候得共若シ同國ニテ是ノ請求ニ應シ難キ時ハ其ノ公使ニ附與セル訓令ノ旨意ヲ變換シ英獨ノ例ニ由リ他ノ政府ヨリ要求ヲ提出スルニ於テハ佛國モ亦同様ノ提議ヲ爲サシムヘキ事ニ修正爲致度希望ニ有之候即チ去七月一日并十日ヲ以テ差進候電報ハ前述ノ趣意ニ有

之候處爾來ノ電信并今般ノ内信ニ據レハ拙者電報ノ意味御了解無之ニ付佛國外務卿ニ對シ或ハ他各國ヨリ請求修正ノ說等起リ候哉モ難計ト曰ハレ或ハ會議ノ開クルマテ廢税ノ議ヲ拋棄セラレ度ト說カレタル事ト被存候申迄モ無之英獨兩公使ハ既ニ前陳ノ如キ訓令ヲ所持致居候ニ付テハ佛國ニテ愈廢税ノ議ヲ固執スル時ハ兩國ニテモ各其要求ヲ提出スルハ必然ニシテ米魯其他既ニ預議會擬定ノ税目ニ對シ同意ヲ表シタル諸國モ亦同然ノ儀ニ有之遂ニ條約改正ノ基礎ヲ破却スルニ至ルノ憂アル儀ハ前條陳述ノ理由ニテ御明解相成度候右ノ事情ニ付テハ拙者ノ佛國ヲシテ其廢税ノ議ヲ撤去セシメントスルハ雷ニ開議前ニ於テ他ノ諸外國ヨリ要求ノ議起ルヲ恐ル、ノミノ故ヲ以テ一時佛國ノ要求ヲ撤去セシメントスルカ如キ一朝ノ姑息ニ出テタル者ニ無之右ハ開議中ニ於テモ佛公使ヨリ廢税ノ議ヲ論出セサル時ハ英獨其他ノ公使モ各其要求ヲ提出スルノ寸隙ヲ得サルカ故ニ條約改正ノ成否ニ付テ緊要ノ關係アル爲メニ有之候

依之爲念七月以來貴官ト往復ノ電信差進候間御熟閱ノ上更ニ其國外務卿ニ御面會相成我政府ノ要望貫徹致候様御盡力相成度切望ニ堪エス候尤絹類輸出税廢止ノ儀ハ我國製産者

abolition of export duty on silk, if other Powers ask any modification of the Tariff agreed to.

Inouye.

註 一 六月二十四日往電ニ相當ナルモノ見當ラヌ

#### 附屬書二

十七年七月十日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

Japanese Minister

Petersburg,

To Hachisuka. I meant just as you understood; that is, if entire withdrawal of that condition be found impossible, try to have instructions to the French Minister in Japan so modified as he shall announce claim of the condition in case only when he finds other Representatives in Conference ask any modifications in tariff as agreed to. This will make the tone of French instructions similar to those of other Powers. It is not possible now to name here amount of general concessions which being still premature.

Inouye.

#### 附屬書三

十七年八月十一日發蜂須賀公使宛往電  
(絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件)

ノ爲メニハ利益不渺隨テ國產ヲ増殖スルノ一助ト相成候儀ニ付右ハ佛政府ノ厚意トシテ可然謝詞御陳述有之度乍去今日ニ於テ此有益ノ提議ヲ聽容セサルハ前陳ノ通り條約改正ノ全體ニ差響キ無余儀謝絶致候旨意明解相成候様同卿ハ御辯說有之度候尤新約締結ノ後ニ至リテハ輸出税條約ノ檢束無之上ハ只我政府一己ノ見込ヲ以テ廢税ヲ施行スル事難キニ非ラス此一項ハ貴官ノ御含迄申添置候此段得貴意候也

註 一 次々三二六及三二七文書ナルニ付參照

2 七月一日及十日附外務卿訓電ハ夫々附屬書一及二

3 「七月以來貴官ト往復ノ電信」ナルモノ見當ラヌ尤

モ附屬書三ニカガ一タメトス

#### 附屬書一

十七年七月一日發蜂須賀公使宛往電

(絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件)

Hachisuka,

Impossible to accept the conditional clause for the reasons I telegraphed 24 ultimo. Represent therefore to the Minister for Foreign Affairs our urgent desire to have it withdrawn or at least modified as follows.

France would ask (not demand conditionally)

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三一八

Hachisuka,

French Minister replied to my despatch of 4th still insisting on the abolition of export duty on silk.

As soon as you receive the copy of my memorandum from Aoki or Komatsubara, take it to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and, among other things, try and convince him by diplomatic exposition inadvisability for France to assume, probably unwillingly, the position of an obstructionist in the pending negotiation which is now so favourably progressing so far as other Powers are concerned. Remind him of the fact that she had taken last year the initiative step to turn the event in favour of Japan. You may also tell him that England, Germany, Russia, America, Spain, all are prepared to accept the memorandum as the basis and no other representative has as yet expressed any thing but satisfaction. If you can find the means to prevail upon to obtain consent to the withdrawal of the French proposition even before the memorandum can be brought to the knowledge

of the French Government, of course the better.

Inouye.

三一九 明治七年九月十二日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

帝國政府ノ覺書受領ノ件

拜啓益御清安奉賀候緒ハ小官過便申進候通獨露兩國へ相越居青木公使ニハ往來ニ立寄面會メモランダム一條ニ付篤ト協議ヲ遂ケ候事ニ御座候花房公使ニモ寛々面會將來萬事篤ト相談致シ置候歸路伯林ニ立寄候節ハ丁度小松原到着致居リ閣下ノ御傳意難有悉皆拜承メモランダムモ篤ト熟覽且私信尊書モ難有落手拜讀實ニ尊意ノ有ル所明瞭ト相成且大體最御同意奉存候依テ過ル六日歸巴後猶篤トメモランダムノ御趣意研究一昨十日佛外務卿請ケ日ニ付可相越考居候處先日ヨリ田舎ニ在リ未タ歸巴無之ニ付止ヲ不得政務局長ビヨ一氏ニ面會篤トメモランダムノ趣意相談委曲承知ニ相成早速外務卿へ通知可相成答ニ返答有之候又昨十一日ハ商務局長クラブレー氏面會同様委曲相談總テ承知ニ相成候絹輸出稅云々ニ付テモ右兩氏へ懇々相談殊ニクラブレー氏へハ最

初ヨリ應接ノ手續有之候ニ付最委敷尊意ノ有ル所相話置當方ノ意ハ十分貫徹致シ候乍去其節ノ即答ニテハ未ダ承諾トハ中々不申聞執レ近日外務卿歸巴次第面會ヲ乞ヒ懇々申入候心得ニ御座候當佛政府へハ我メモランダム七月二十六日便ニテ漸昨日クラブレー氏ト談話ノ席へ到着故同氏はヨリ篤ト熟讀研究相成候答猶不審ノ廉ハ尋吳候様申入置候ニ付其次第二ニ寄り電信ヲ以テ追々御問合致候哉モ難計候小生ニハ誠ニ明瞭ニ拜承先以即今御問合致候義ハ無之乍去最惠國條款ノ事ハ尊意如何程迄ヲ御望ミ有之候哉一點ノ疑問有之且最要點ニ付今便公信ニテ差進候寫ノ通電報ヲ以御尋問ニ及置<sup>2</sup>御返電相待居候小官モ是迄ハ何分電報上ニテ極メテ明瞭ニ尊意ノ在ル所ヲ了解スルニ苦シミ居候處此度ノメモランダムニテ全ク分明致シ候ニ付小官畢生ノ力ヲ竭シ可申覺悟ニ御座候マルシヤルニモ別テ勉勵盡力候様御申越ノ處當時休暇差許中スピーニ逗留依テ早速メモランダム寫ハ相示シ置候得共同人近頃何分病氣勝ニ有之殊ニ筆紙ニ盡シ難キ情實モ有之先ツ即今ノ處佛政府トノ談判ハ小官一身ニ引受盡力ノ心得ニ御座候一兩日中白國ヲ始メ他兼任國政府へモ先ツ書翰ヲ以メモランダム云々申込候心得ニ付其上ニテマ

ルシヤルヲ近邊ニモ候ニ付ブリュッセル府へ遣シランベルモン氏へ篤ト爲相話候心算ニ有之候

(以下省略)

明治十七年九月十二日

巴府ヨリ

茂 詔 頓首拜

井上外務卿閣下

(追申省略)

註 一 二六文書參看

2 「電報ヲ以御尋問ニ及」トアル右電信寫見當ラズ

三二〇 明治七年九月十八日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出稅廢止交渉ニ關スル件

過ル十二日内啓拜呈以來絹輸出稅云々佛政府へ申入方且彼我讓與ノ手續云々兩度御電報ノ趣委曲敬承致シ候然ル處小官ヨリ右一條ニ付先達テ佛外務卿へ申入方何分小官御趣意取違へ候哉ニ御考ノ趣御申越甚恐縮存候乍去小官ニ於テハ決シテ御訓令ニ相違ノ義佛政府へ申入候様ニハ存シ不申候第一絹稅廢止ノ事ヲ佛政府主張致シ候時ハ他各國ヨリモ稅

則ニ付種々ノ修正說ヲ提出スルノ恐レ有リト小官ヨリ佛外務卿へ申入候ハ則最初六月廿五日落手致シ候貴電信ヲ遵奉致シ候モノニテ折角他各國ニ於テハ異議ナク今日組立成就セシ税則際限ナキ修正ヲ要スル事ト相成哉モ難計隨テ殆ト締結セントスル條約重修猶又延引スルヲ深患フルトノ意ヲ示シ候モノニ御座候

第二若シ佛政府ニ於テ絹稅廢止ノ發議ヲ全ク差引キ取消ス能ハザルニ於テハ此度開カントスル東京議會ノ節迄取除キ候様希望スルトノ訓令ヲ得タクト小官ヨリ佛外務卿へ申入候ハ則七月一日同十日ノ兩貴電信ニ有之如ク他各國ニ於テ東京議會ニテ稅則ニ付或ル修正說ヲ提出スル如キ場合ニハ佛政府ヨリモ右發議ヲ提出シ得ルトノ御訓令ヲ奉シ全ク右發議ヲ差引能ハザルニ於テハ東京議會開設迄右發議ヲ取除キ候様有之度ト佛政府へ申入候事ニテ他各國ニ於テ一ノ修正說モ提出無之時ハ勿論佛政府ニ於テ右發議ハ提出セザル事ニ申入候事ニ御座候

諸右一條ニ付テハ過日メモランダム拜受ビヨ一氏クラブレ一氏へ面會ノ節篤ト申入置有之候其要點ハ稅則ヲ承諾スルノコンヂションニ絹稅廢止ノ事ヲ發議セラレ候事我政府ノ

過ル十三日佛白西葡瑞各政府へ書翰ヲ以我メモランダム速ニ檢査ノ上同意アラン事ヲ希望シ且同意ニ於テハ右メモランダムヲ基礎トシテ商議ヲ開ク事并ニコンヴエーションニ調印ノ事在日本各國公使或ハ代理者へ電信ヲ以全權ヲ與ラレ候様希望スル旨申入置候  
右件々申上置度草々申上留候也

明治十七年九月十八日

瑞西ベルヌ府

茂 詔 拜

## 外務卿閣下

猶々清佛關係ハ一時全ク戰爭ニ可相成形況御座候處其後先ツ其儘ニテ白眼合ノ姿此節ノ新聞ニハ仲裁云々等相見ヘ候得共佛ハ容易ニ承諾致間敷トノ事ニ有之先ツ差シタル異聞無ク日々經過致候得共此先キ畢竟如何可相成哉何分速ニ結局ヲ見難キ事歟ト察セラレ候清政府ヨリ我政府ヘ戰爭ヲ公報シタリトハ實ニ意外ノ事ニテ其舉動何トモ解シ難キ事ニ御座候過ル十一日附ニテ相呈シ候電報申上候通り佛政府ハ全ク切迫ノ景況ニ立至ラザル限りハ戰爭ヲ公告スル意ハ決テ無之トノ事ニ有之乍去石炭ノ問題

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三三一

困却スル所ニ有之既ニ各國ト協議シ成就セシ稅則ノ組立ニ響キ候事故斷然右發議ハ取消シ吳候様而シテ我政府ノジスクレツションニ委シ置候ハ、他日之ヲ廢止スルノ好機可有之段懇々申入置候事ニ御座候今日マデハ未ダ承諾ノ返答ヲ得不申候得共此困難ヲ除ク爲ニハ別テ盡力ノ心算ニ御座候間此段御承知奉希候

佛外務卿本月中ハ各國大使公使ヲ請ケ不申トノ事報知有之依テ瑞西國へハ此節一寸ナリトモ顔出シ致シ置候覺悟ニ有之メモランダムノ事モ篤ト當政府へ相話置度過ル十四日巴府ヲ發シ翌十五日當地へ到着當政府ニ談話爲相濟候上來ル廿三日頃歸巴ノ心算ニ御座候或ハ斯ル肝要ノ御用アリナガラ巴府ニ止ラズ如何ナル必要アツテ瑞西へ越シタル歟トノ御不審モ可有之存候得共纔ニ十日間程ノ逗留殊ニ佛政府ニ於テモ我メモランダム落手已來未ダ日數無之研究熟覽ノ暇ヲモ與ヘ不申テハ決答ヲ得難キ事ニ有之且佛外務卿ハ不在ニテ何分速ニ面會ノ術無之彼是ニテ當地迄旅行候事情宜御尊察奉希候尤佛外務卿萬一長々不在ニ候得ハ旅行先ニテモ可成速ニ面會致シ度即今聞合中ニ御座候其次第二寄臨機應變進退取極可申覺悟ニ御座候

ニ付テハ萬一ヲ慮リ一應話シ置クトノ事ビヨ一氏ヨリ申聞候ニ付御參考ノ爲メ必要ト相考電信ニテ申上候事ニ有之委曲ハ右ニ譲リ再ヒ爰ニ贅言不致候先ハ右要點而已草々又拜

註 1「六月廿五日落手致シ候貴電信」ナルモノ見當ラズ  
2 三二八附屬書一、二電信參照

明治十七年十月三日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ

井上外務卿宛

## 絹輸、出稅廢止ニ關スル件

附屬書 十月一日(?)佛外務卿談話書

拜啓當國外務卿 Jules Ferry 氏去ル土曜日歸巴致シ候間一昨水曜日ヲ以テ面會條約改正事件懇々談話ニ及候上生糸輸出稅廢止ノ發議取消シ方再三申込候得共何分承諾難致旨ノ決答ニ候間其旨昨日早速別紙寫ノ通り及電稟候猶又別紙佛文談話書差出シ候間御熟覽被下度奉存候到底佛政府ノ意ハ生糸稅ノ廢止佛國ノ利益ニ關スル重大ノ件ニ付是非共之ヲ得ルヲ要ス若シ日本政府ニ於テ新稅目ト併論スルヲ欲セザレハ是ト別件ニスルハ承知スベシ然ルニ於テハ別段ノ約束



ヲ以テ生糸輸出税ヲ廢止スル事要用ナリ且該約束ハ會議ノ開設前ニ之ヲ締結スルヲ要ストノ申分ニ有之候ニ付此段及中稟候也

明治十七年十月三日

在佛特命全權公使 蜂須賀茂韶

外務卿井上馨殿

猶々別紙談話書中ニモ掲載有之候通英獨ヲ始税則ノ事ニ付テハ一ノ修正説ヲモ提出セズ reserve 致シ居ル趣申述候處右ハ別段修正説ヲ出スヘキ程ノ重大ナル件無之故ナルヘク佛ニ於テハ生糸輸出税ノ事ハ重大ノ問題ニ付是非共此際廢止ヲ希望スルトノ返答ニ有之何處迄モ前議主張ノ意ニ相見ヘ候察スルニ在日本佛公使ヨリモ同様ノ意ヲ以外務卿ヘ申來リシモノナラン歟先達テ小官外務卿ト應接ノ節ハ此度ノ如ク固執スルノ口氣ハ相見ヘザリシ事ニ御座候執ニセヨ御訓令通り行届カザルハ小官ニ於テ遺憾恐縮存候得共何分致シ方無之御返電ヲ相待居候事ニ御座候也

話 一十月二日蜂須賀公使發ノ電信見當ラズ

附屬書

Japonais nous a *promis* de l'abolir ; mais il faudrait arriver à une entente.

M. Hachisuka.—Je voulais justement parler à Votre Excellence de cette question. La France maintient cette proposition comme condition  *sine qua non* de l'acceptation du nouveau tarif. Si la France insiste sur cette question, cela amènerait une perturbation à la voie de l'agrément du tarif. Comme nous faisons des concessions générales pour l'ensemble les nations étrangères, une proposition de cette nature nous crée des embarras considérables, parceque tous les autres pays sont disposés à accepter le nouveau tarif sans aucune modification. Puisqu'on accepte le tarif tel qu'il est résulte de l'accord de la conférence de 1882, nous proposons nos concessions générales telles que le cabotage, les ports accessibles, l'extension des passeports, etc.; et les pays étrangers consentent à leur tour à l'application des règlements d'administration des autorités locales et de la police sur les sujets étrangers.

M. Jules Ferry.—Si les autres gouvernements ne

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 三三三

十七年十月一日(一) 佛外務卿談話書

Procès-verbal de l'entrevue entre S. E. M. Jules Ferry, Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France et S. E. M. Hachisuka, Ministre du Japon à Paris.

M. Hachisuka.—Mon gouvernement a envoyé à tous les représentants des puissances étrangères à Tokio, un mémorandum en réponse au memorandum présenté par S. E. M. Plunket, Ministre d'Angleterre à Tokio. Ce mémorandum est destiné à tous les pays ; il doit être parvenu à Votre Excellence par les soins de S. E. M. Sienkiewicz, Ministre de France au Japon.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je l'ai reçu et j'en ai pris connaissance ; je vois que vous demandez dès maintenant une abolition partielle de la juridiction consulaire. Est-ce que les concessions que vous donnez, équivalant à celles que demandez ? Pour nous il y a toujours cette question du droit d'exportation sur la soie ; il n'y a pas entre nous de division à proprement parler, parceque le gouvernement

demandent pas de modifications au nouveau tarif, il faut en conclure qu'ils n'y ont pas intérêt. Pour nous la question du droit d'exportation de la soie est une question capitale. Dans l'intérêt des Français (acheteurs) aussi bien que dans celui des Japonais (producteurs), ce serait un intérêt économique d'en abolir les droits d'exportation ; s'agit-il des intérêts financiers (fiscaux), je ne crois pas non plus cette abolition comme contraire à ces intérêts ; car si la force productive de la soie est augmentée par l'abolition de ses droits d'exportation, l'importation augmenterait dans la même mesure et cela donnerait lieu à l'augmentation des recettes des droits d'importation.

M. Hachisuka.—Il est possible que le gouvernement Japonais pense comme Votre Excellence ; mais là n'est pas la question ; je prie Votre Excellence de se mettre dans notre situation ; tous les pays acceptent, excepté la France ; est-ce que Votre Excellence ne se trouverait pas dans de grands embarras ; je ne parle pas des discussions économiques. Mon gouvernement demande à Votre Excellence de retirer

cette proposition et de laisser la question à notre *discretion*; est-ce qu'elle veut bien y consentir.

M. Jules Ferry.—Non, je ne puis pas accepter Votre demande.

M. Hachisuka.—Les instructions que j'ai reçues se bornent à faire des démarches pour obtenir le retrait de la proposition française et de laisser à notre *discretion* la question de l'abolition du droit d'exportation sur la soie. De toute façon je dois demander à Votre Excellence de séparer la question c. à d. de ne pas la lier à l'acceptation du tarif et de ne pas la rendre conditionnelle.

M. Jules Ferry.—La forme n'est égale, l'essentiel est d'arriver à un résultat. Si le gouvernement Japonais veut séparer la question, je la dégrèrèrai; mais alors il faudrait une promesse formelle de l'abolir.

Donc voici ma réponse: "Le gouvernement Japonais me demande de retirer notre proposition; je ne puis pas l'accepter. Mais je pourrai séparer et dégrèr la question de la condition de l'acceptation du nouveau tarif; mais alors il faut un en-

agement formel et *préalable* (avant les travaux de la conférence) d'abolir ce droit d'exportation dans un certain laps de temps. Je vous prie d'en référer à votre gouvernement et d'en recevoir la réponse avant la prochain entrevue."

M. Hachisuka.—Je m'empresserai de télégraphier à mon gouvernement ce dont nous avons causé aujourd'hui et lui demanderai la réponse.

(fin)

明治十七年十月三日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

### 絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

副内啓九月十二日落手致シ候ニ通ノ貴電信<sup>1</sup>ニモ猶又御申越有之候通り佛政府ニ於テ萬一全ク生糸税云々ノ發議ヲ取消能ハサルニ於テハ英獨同様 *reserve* 致シ置會議開設ノ上場合ニ應シ發議有之度尤他國ニモ *modification* ヲ提出スル場合ノ外ハ *reserve* 有之度トノ御訓令委曲拜承其意ヲ以過日當外務卿ハ申入候處本書ニモ申入候通ノ返答振ニテ他ニハ拘ラス即今此生糸税廢止ヲ約束致シ度トノ論確然主張セ

付参照

明治十七年十月十七日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

### 絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

ラレル事ニ有之年去今日他國ニハ異議ナク新税目承諾ノ場合故此問題ヲ「コンヂシヨネル」トシテナラデハ佛ニ於テ新税目ヲ承諾難相成トノ發議ハ實ニ我政府ノ困難スル所ナル趣繰返シ申入候處其段ハ篤ト了承致吳ラレ生糸税問題ハ別段ノ約束ヲ即今取結ヒ度トノ申聞ニ御座候其意ハ則此先期限ヲ定廢止スベシトノ約束ヲ欲スルトノ意ニ御座候或ハ別紙談話書<sup>2</sup>此點ヲ十分盡ササル哉ノ恐レ御座候ニ付念ノ爲メ爰ニ申上置候也

十七年十月三日

茂 詔

外務卿閣下

猶々談話書ハ生糸税一件ヲ重モンシテ認メ候事故我メモランダム一條ニ付外務卿ハ申入候个條ヲ盡ク相掲ケ無之候得共我政府ニ於テ此度ノ改正ハ税目貿易問題ノミナラス第一法權問題ニ付其幾部分ノ改正ヲ要スル事我政府ノ主眼ナル趣其他小松原ヲ以御申越ノ條中至要ノ點ハ夫々申入置候事ニ御座候間此段モ宜御承知可被下候也

註 1 「九月十二日落手致シ候ニ通ノ貴電信」ナルモノ見

當ラズ

2 「別紙談話書」ハ前號文書附屬書トシテ收載セルニ

參考ノ爲メ申上置候

然ルニ佛政府ノ情實ヲ察スレハ又不得止モノ有之様相考候其故ハ此條約重修問題ハ當國議院ノ承諾ヲ得サレハ締結シ難キ事ニ付佛政府ヘ我政府ヨリ與フル讓與ノ點不十分ニテハ議院ノ承諾ヲ難得事ニ有之沿海貿易ノ事内地旅行券制度ノ事等ノ如キ英獨同様ノインテレスト無之止ヲ得ザレハ新税目ト引離シ別段ノ約束ニテナリトモ是非佛國ノ利益ニ大關係アル生糸稅廢止ハ我政府ノ承諾ヲ得度トノ意嚮ニ有之畢竟約セバ英獨ハ此度ノ我メモランダムヲ承諾スルモ得ル所多々有之然ルニ佛政府ノ利益ハ全ク僅々ニ止マルトノ考ヨリ飽迄モ前議ヲ主張スル様相聞全ク佛政府ニ於テ無理而已ヲ申トモ考ヘ難ク候尤新税目ヨリ引離シ別段ノ約束ニテ我政府生糸稅廢止ヲ今日約束スルニ於テハ是ヲ當國議院ヘ通知スルハ他ノ問題トハ全ク特別ト爲シ委員内會ニ示シ決テ表面ヘ顯サ、ル事トナスモ我ガ望ナラバ爲シ得ベキトノ事ハ過日小官面會ノ節當外務卿ヨリ談話有之候事ニ有之前便談話中ニ此點申上落シ候ニ付爰ニ申上候

又我メモランダムニ付テハ別段佛ニ於テ意見ハ無之トノ口氣ハ過便差出候本月八日小官ト當外務卿トノ談話書中ニ有

恐縮奉存候然ルニ右小官ヨリ談判致候時ニハ速ニ決議會ヲ御開キ相成事哉ト想察貴君ヨリ我メモランダムヲ各國ヘ御差出可相成事等ハ預知難致時ニ有之隨テ佛外務卿ノ中ス所則全體讓與ノ如何ヲ知ラズシテハ此絹類一件ノ發議ヲ拋棄スルトモ或ハセザルトモ決答難致トノ意ハ無理ナラザル事ニ相考候ヨリ前顯ノ如キ談判ニ至リ候事ニ御座候而シテ一言爰ニ申上度義ハ此度ノ第廿七號機密信<sup>1</sup>中ニモ御掲載有之「佛公使ニ附與セル訓令ノ旨意ヲ變換シ英獨ノ例ニ由リ他ノ政府ヨリ要求ヲ提出スルニ於テハ佛國モ亦同様ノ提議ヲ爲サシムベキ事ニ修正爲致度希望ニ有之候」トノ御文義ニ由レハ或ハ英獨ハ他ノ政府ニ先ダチ要求ヲ提出セズ他ノ政府ハ隨意ニ要求ヲ提出セラル、如ク相見ヘ而シテ佛國モ英獨同様他ノ政府ヨリ要求ヲ提出後ナラデハ提議ヲ爲サ、ル事ヲ御希望有之事ニ相見ヘ約シテ申セバ他ノ政府ニ一步ヲ讓ルヲ要スト申趣意ニ相成候乍去如此見解ハ果シテ貴君ノ御趣意ニ有之間敷拜察致シ候得共然ルニ於テハ英獨ノ例ニ寄リ他ノ政府ヨリ要求ヲ提出セザルニ於テハ提議ヲ爲サ、ル事ヲ各國政府ニ望マン歟是則單ニ一ノ要求ヲモ然サ、ルヲ望ムト同様ノ結果ト可相成如何トナレハ孰レノ政府モ他

之通ニ付此生糸稅ノ問題サヘ片付候得ハ他事ハ我メモランダムノ通り承諾ヲ得候事且我メモランダムヲ基礎トシテ東京會議ニテ談判ノ委任并ニコンヴェンション調印ノ事ヲ在日本佛公使ヘ電訓ノ事ハ速ニ相運可申ト小官ハ相信シ申候右申上度内啓如此御座候也

十七年十月十七日

巴里ヨリ

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

(追申省略)

註

1 十月二日蜂須賀公使發外務卿宛電報見當ラス

2 十月八日蜂須賀公使ト佛外務卿トノ談話書及翌九日

内啓信ナルモノト共ニ見當ラズ

三三四 明治七年月三十日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出稅廢止ニ關スル件

内啓諸ハ九月十三日附機密信<sup>1</sup>第廿七號ヲ以御來示ノ絹類輸出稅一件ニ付御回答ハ今便ノ機密信ヲ以申上候通ニ有之御來示ノ大趣意ハ貴地會議開設迄絹類廢稅ノ發議ヲ拋棄致吳度小官ヨリ佛外務卿ヘ申入候事御訓令ヲ誤解セリトノ事ト

ノ政府ニ先ダチ提議セサル時ハ則提議ナキニ歸スルハ勿論ニ有之每度甚僭越ナガラ一應氣付ノ儘ヲ無腹藏申上候段江海ノ量ヲ以御聽容所希ニ御座候

(欄外)但シ商務局長クラブレー氏ヘハ此ノ訓令ノ點再三申入候事ニ御座候且外務卿ヘモ申入候得共同卿ノ申スニハ英獨ハ他ニ即今要求ヲ提出スル如キ問題ナキヨリ如此訓令ヲ下シタルモノナルヘシ佛ハ何分此例ニ倣ヒ難シト申聞候

然ルニ右申稟ハ既往ニ屬シ本月二日小官ヨリ電信ヲ以陳述致シ候通り且其後郵便ニテモ申稟致候通り此絹類輸出稅問題ハ此度ノ我メモランダムヲ基礎トシテ重修スヘキ條約ニハ無關係ノモノトシ候事ハ佛政府ニテ必承諾可致乍去貴地會議御開設前ニ彌何時之ヲ廢スヘシトノ我政府ノ決心ヲ承知シ豫メ内約ヲ即今ヨリ致置度佛政府ノ趣意ニ有之依テ此事御決答無之内ハ此度ノ我メモランダムヲ基礎トシテ貴地ニテ商議スヘシトノ佛政府ヨリ在日本佛公使ヘノ訓令隨テコンヴェンションニ調印ノ全權ヲ與フル命令等電信ニテ申遣候事モ相運ヒ中間敷ト心配致シ候間何卒右御決答ハ一日モ速ニ拜承致シ度相待居候事ニ御座候

右條々尊覽ヲ奉願候也

十七年十月三十日

巴里ヨリ

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

(追中省略)

註 1 三一八文書ナルニ付參照

2 本電綴込簿中見當ラズ

三二五 明治七年十月二十日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 絹輸出税廢止要求ニ關スル件

機密 第六十四號

十二月十二日到

本年九月十三日機第二十七號<sup>1</sup>ヲ以テ佛國ヨリ絹類輸出税廢止要求ノ義ニ付御來示ノ趣旨夫々了承致シ候小官ニ於テ御訓令ノ意旨ヲ了解無之トニ有之候得共之レハ小官ヨリ追々御報道申上置候事ニテ充分誤解無之御訓令通りニ當國政府へ申込候事既ニ御承知相成候事ト存候得共爲念左ニ説明致候

一 御來示中「七月十八日ノ貴信<sup>2</sup>ニ依レハ貴官ニハ同卿(佛

相掲ゲ候事ニ有之候

一、「佛政府ニ於テ右議ヲ全ク拋棄スル事能ハザルトキハ先ヅ會議ノ開クル迄之レヲ拋棄セラレ度」請求致候故御訓令ニ相違致候様御來示ニ候得共此ハ全ク貴官ニ於テ小官ノ御報道ニ及候事ノ全體ヲ能ク御照考被下候ハハ明瞭相成ルベク存候報告書中ニモ掲置候通り又再三商務局長クラヴリ一氏トモ掛合候通 faire renoncer la question au moins jusqu'à la conférence; une fois la conférence ouverte les autres plenipotentiaires pourront faire des propositions et si dans cette occasion la question sera soulevée, le gouvernement Japonais la prendra en considération. トニ有之其意味タル「若シ拋棄スル事能ハザルトキハ會議ノ開クル迄ハ廢税ノ議ヲ拋棄セラレ度一旦會議相開キ候上ニテ他ノ全權公使ニ於テ發議ヲ提出スル事アル哉モ不被計若シ此ノ場合ニ於テ佛國ヨリ其要求ヲ提出スルトキハ之レヲ考フヘシ」トニ有之候右ノ如ク成リ行キ候ハ全ク佛外務卿ノ云フ如ク Si nous trouvons un équivalent sous une forme quelconque, on pourrait renoncer, mais nous ne pouvons pas

國外務卿)ニ對シ若シ佛國ニテ右廢税ノ要求ヲ拋棄セサルトキハ他各國ヨリモ請求修正ノ說等起リ候哉モ難計申込候」ト有之即チ御來示ノ通りニテ右演述ハ全ク御訓令通り佛國ヨリ絹類輸出税廢止ノ議ヲ提出スルトキハ折角擬定ノ税額ヲ承諾致居候英獨其他ニ於テモ同様ノ議題ヲ論出スルニ至ルトノ趣旨ニ相叶候事ニ有之候此點ハ外務卿へ面會前ニ當外務省商務局長クラヴリー氏ニモ度々重復申込置候事ニ有之候且七月十六日小官ト外務卿ト面會報告書中 tous les gouvernements d'Europe sont disposés à agréer le tarif sans aucune altération. Si cette proposition est soutenue, le gouvernement Japonais serait embarrassé et craindrait beaucoup que l'accord ne pourra plus se faire, les autres pays pouvant faire la même chose ト有之右ノ意味タル「他ノ政府ハ皆承知シタリ然ルニ佛國ノ要求ヲ維持セラル、時ハ日不政府ハ甚ダ迷惑ナリ何トナレバ他ノ國モ佛國ト同様ノ請求ヲ提出スル哉モ不被計其時ハ既ニ出來致居候一致モ爲メニ破却セラハ、ヲ以テナリ」トノ事ニ有之候素ヨリ實地ノ掛合ニ於テハ一ツ事ヲ再三申述候事ニ有之候得共報告書ニハ其要點ヲ

nous lier dès maintenant. Cela dépendra de l'équivalent et surtout de la conférence. 未ダ(七月頃)佛政府ニ於テ全體ノ讓與ヲ知ラズ故ニ「他ニ絹類税廢止ニ代ハル利益ヲ發見スルトキハ之レヲ廢止スルヲ得ベシ然レドモ未ダ如何ナル利益ヲ得ル事ナル哉不相分故ニ今ヨリ廢止ノ發議ヲ全ク拋棄スル事能ハズ」トノ次第ナリ然ラバ會議迄ハ其儘ニ差置(laisser de côté)即チ會議相開キ候上ニテ他ノ利益ヲ發見スル事ヲ勉メ若シ之レヲ發見スル事能ハズ如何シテモ佛國ノ要求ヲ提出セザルヲ得ズトノ場合ニ至リ候ハハ致方無之トノ事情ヨリ開會迄ハ拋棄トノ事ニ相成候事ニテ「開會迄ハ拋棄致吳度開會ノ上ハ勝手ニ申出テ宜シキ」トノ趣旨ヲ申述タル事ニハ聊カ無之候即チ右事情ノ談判ノ末報告書中ニ記載ノ通り la question sera retirée jusqu'à la conférence, et, une fois la conférence ouverte on cherchera de trouver un équivalent sous une forme quelconque, et dans le cas qu'on ne le trouverait pas, le représentant de la France verra s'il y a lieu de soulever la question. 「開議迄ハ拋棄スベシ而シテ開會ノ上ハ全體ノ讓與モ相分リ可中其時ハ絹

類稅廢止ノ利益ニ代リ得ル(何レノ形ヲ以テナリトモ)他ノ利益ヲ發見スル事ヲ勉ムベシ若シ萬一之レヲモ發見スル事能ハザルトキハ佛公使ハ其時ニ至リ絹類稅廢止ノ要求ヲ提出スルヲ尙ホ必要ナリトスル哉否ヲ勘考<sup>ウヱ</sup>スベシ」トノ訓令ヲ電報ニテ佛政府ヨリ在日本佛公使へ送り候事ニ相決シタル事ニ有之候

一、其趣旨ハ絹類稅廢止又ハ之レニ代リ得ル利益ヲ必ス要求スルヲ要ストノ決心ニ有之候故前條ノ如ク相成行キ候事ニテ小官ニ於テ御來示ノ如ク訓令ニ相違シタル掛合ヲ爲シタル等ノ事聊カ無之候爾來在日本佛公使へ差出サレタル我覺書モ佛政府ニ達シ相互讓與ノ全體モ判然致候故猶又佛發議廢止ノ事申込候處右覺書中ノ利益ニテハ絹類稅廢止ノ利益ニ代ルモノ無之トノ趣旨ヨリ遂ニ先日電信并ニ談話書ヲ以テ申進候通り此問題ヲ全ク別物ニ致シテ相談致シ度トノ事ニ迄相成り行キ候事ニ有之候右ノ事情ニテ最早今日ニテハ御來示ノ件既往ニ屬シ候姿ナレトモ誤解ノ廉ニ候事故爲念一應如前及御說明置候

一、此他御注意ノ點ハ既ニ小官ヨリ再三當外務卿ニ向テ喋喋申込置候事ニ有之候

ニ調印ノ全權ヲ在日本佛公使へ與ヘ吳可申哉相尋候様トノ御内訓ニ有之依テ小官ニ於テハ御内訓ヨリ一層用心ヲ加ヘ小官一己ノ說トシテ若シ日本政府ニ於テコンヴェンション締結後速ニ日本政府自ラ絹類稅廢止ヲ實行スル事ノ決意アラハ之ヲ佛政府へ今ヨリ通知スルニ於テハ我覺書ノ个條總テ承諾致シ吳レ可申哉試問致候事ニ御座候而シテ此通知ハ全ク口上ニテ佛外務卿迄申入候事ニ止マル小官ノ素意ニ有之候處佛外務卿ハ斯ル場合ニ及ハ、其通知ヲ書面ヲ以テ致シ得ヘキ哉トノ事并ニ佛議院委員會へハ新條約批准ノ節ニハ機密トシテ是非示ス事必要ナルベシトノ事ニ有之且此通知ヲ約定トスルセザルノ論及ヒ我覺書ノ悉ク承諾有之哉否ノ處未タ外務卿手許ニテ取調中ニ有之何分當便結局申上候事ニ不相至先ツ今日迄談話書貴覽ニ呈シ申候尤過日ヨリ三度ノ談話ニテ兎モ角外務卿ト小官トノ間一己ノ資格ヲ以テ雙方ノ意見ヲ折衷シ假ニ談話書ヲ作り之ヲ電信ニテ貴官ノ御裁決御答電ヲ仰ク事ニ相成リ居リ必四五日中ニハ外務卿ヨリ返答可有之筈昨十二日外務卿ト談話ノ節口約致シ置候先ハ右不取敢申上置候也

十七年十一月十三日

右回答申進候也

明治十七年十月三十一日

駐佛特命全權公使侯爵 蜂須賀 茂 詔

外務卿伯爵井上馨殿

註 1 及 2 夫々三一八、三一六文書參照

三二六

明治十七年二月三日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ 井上外務卿宛

絹輸出稅問題ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十七年十一月五日佛外務卿談話書

二 十七年十一月六日佛外務卿談話書

三 十七年十一月十二日佛外務卿談話書

内啓絹稅一條ニ付テハ過ル七日附呈書ニハ外務卿ト談話結局ニ不至當便可申候趣申上置候處其後外務卿ニ於テ猶未タ返答ノ場合ニ不至今便モ結局如何ハ申上不能候乍去先日來ノ談話ハ別紙佛文談話書ニテ委曲御承知奉希候十月三十日落掌致候貴電信中若シ佛政府ノ發議拋棄シ吳度トノ我カ請求行届カサル時ハ小官一己ノ說トシテ若シ日本政府ニテ絹稅廢止承諾スルニ於テハ佛政府ハ我覺書ニアル个條ヲ承諾之ヲ基礎トシテ東京ニテ商議スル事并ニコンヴェンション

茂 詔 拜

外務卿閣下

註 1 及 2 「過ル七日附呈書」及「十月三十日落掌致候貴電信」ナルモノ見當ラズ

附屬書一

十七年十一月五日佛外務卿談話書

Procès-verbal de l'entrevue de S. E. M. Hachisuka, Ministre du Japon à Paris, avec S. E. M. Jules Ferry, Président du Conseil et Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France.

Paris le 5 novembre 1884.

M. Hachisuka.—Je viens de recevoir de mon gouvernement des instructions par voie télégraphique à propos de la question de l'abolition des droits sur les soies. Ce sont des réponses à des dépêches que je lui ai adressées tout à fait au commencement du mois d'octobre; c'est dire à V. E. que le gouvernement japonais a mis environ 30 jours pour prendre la question en sérieuse considération. D'après ces dépêches mon gouvernement me fait

savoir qu'il ne peut pas accepter la proposition de prendre un *engagement* séparé d'abolir ces droits à telle date déterminée d'avance. D'un autre côté, d'après une dépêche confidentielle que j'ai reçue par la poste, S. E. M. Ino-ouyé me dit que la demande française d'abolir ces droits d'exportation est *profitable* aux producteurs japonais, et me charge même d'exprimer à V. E. nos remerciements pour la bonne *nature* même de la proposition, *mais* il ne peut pas l'accepter car une telle modification amènerait une perturbation au tarif déjà agréée. D'après ces deux dépêches, je conclus : 1. que le gouvernement japonais n'est pas opposé au *principe* même de l'abolition ; 2. qu'il ne peut cependant pas le faire dans la circonstance actuelle de crainte d'apporter de la perturbation dans le tarif ; 3. qu'il désire que la question soit laissée à sa discrétion et que tôt ou tard il abolira ces droits de sa *propre volonté* ; 4. qu'il ne peut pas prendre un engagement avec la France sur cette abolition.

M. Jules Ferry.—D'après votre exposé, je vois que cela n'avance pas beaucoup.

les droits d'exportation des soies. Je suis donc convaincu que le Gouvernement japonais est *absolument opposé* à prendre un engagement avec la France sur ce sujet ; mais je crois aussi que le Gouvernement japonais abolira *effectivement* ces droits après la conclusion de la Convention. Je prie V. E. de vouloir bien discerner la manière de voir de notre gouvernement quant à la question elle-même et les raisons qui le forcent à refuser votre demande.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je comprends parfaitement ce que V. E. me dit ; mais est-ce que le Gouvernement japonais ferait cette abolition à une date déterminée ?

M. Hachisuka.—Je crois qu'il le ferait *aussitôt* après la conclusion de la convention mais de sa propre volonté ; il ne peut pas accepter de le faire *venant de l'initiative étrangère*.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je comprends parfaitement ; pour moi la question de forme m'est égale ; l'essentiel est d'arriver à un résultat ; si le Gouvernement japonais est disposé à abolir ces droits, pourquoi

M. Hachisuka.—La question du tarif doit être réglée en principe, comme nous le voulons sans pour cela nous entendre avec les puissances étrangères ; nous *devons* avoir une autonomie complète sur cette question. A présent la question du tarif d'*importation* est le résultat des conventions ; mais quant au tarif de l'exportation, cela est resté comme si cela était de notre autonomie ; nous avons même plusieurs exemples d'avoir aboli tel droit d'exportation sur tel article et cela de notre propre initiative et de notre propre volonté ; si donc aujourd'hui nous prenons un engagement avec la France, pour abolir un droit d'*exportation*, outre les considérations des circonstances actuelles, cela *annulerait* notre habitude d'autonomie et cela créerait un précédent fâcheux pour que les autres pays formulent les demandes de même nature ; d'un autre côté tout le monde accepte le tarif, excepté la France ; toutes les démarches surannées que nous faisons pour la révision des traités, se trouvent obstruées aujourd'hui au moment même de la conclusion par le *seul fait* de l'objection française sur

s'opposerait-t-il à prendre un engagement ?

M. Hachisuka.—C'est justement là qu'est le point essentiel ; je ne puis que répéter à V. E. que ce que j'ai déjà dit, à savoir : Mon gouvernement désire que la question soit complètement laissée à notre discrétion et que cette abolition soit effectuée de sa *propre volonté* et non par suite d'un engagement pris avec la France ; si mon gouvernement fait cette abolition de sa propre initiative, le résultat reviendrait au même ; mais *de* faire cette abolition par nous même à la faire par suite d'un engagement, il y a loin. (M. Jules Ferry réfléchit pendant quelque temps mais il ne trouve pas de conclusion tout en s'opposant à notre demande.)

M. Hachisuka.—Je viens d'exposer à V. E. la nature de mes instructions et les effets que j'en déduis ; maintenant vu la circonstance, je prierais V. E. de vouloir bien me permettre de lui dire mon opinion *purement personnelle*.

Je vois que V. E. désire savoir si l'on fera cette abolition donc si mon gouvernement m'autorise à

déclarer verbalement à V. E. qu'il le fera aussitôt que possible après la conclusion de la convention, V. E. serait-elle disposée à accepter *toutes* les choses mentionnées dans notre mémorandum, l'accepter comme bases de négociations, et à envoyer des pleins pouvoirs de signer la convention à M. Sienkiewicz?

M. Jules Ferry.—L'essentiel est de pouvoir dire aux Chambres que nous avons un *engagement* du Gouvernement Japonais; est-ce que V. E. peut dans ce cas me remettre une note confirmant votre déclaration verbale?

M. Hachisuka.—Cela pourrait peut-être se faire; mais je préviendrais d'avance V. E. que ce ne serait pas un engagement; ce serait une obligation morale; ce serait pour *assurer* V. E. que l'abolition es fera aussitôt après la conclusion de la Convention puisqu'elle désirerait le savoir.

M. Jules Ferry.—Est-ce que ce serait tout simplement pour me donner une *assurance sans résultat*?

M. Hachisuka.—Si je remets à V. E. une note *lassurant* que le Gouvernement Japonais fera l'aboli-

tion aussitôt après la conclusion de la Convention, cela se *fera* effectivement et le résultat serait le même que s'il y avait un *engagement*. Mais je veux dire à V. E. que cette note ne sera pas d'un caractère *d'engagement*; ce sera une note qui aura un résultat *effectif*.

M. Jules Ferry.—V. E. cherche une forme pour une note qui aura le résultat d'un engagement, laquelle ne soit pas un engagement, cela me semble fort difficile.

M. Hachisuka.—Maintenant je prierais V. E. de vouloir bien résumer votre désir, pour que je puisse télégraphier clairement et sans erreur à mon gouvernement la substance de notre entretien.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je ne pourrai pas le faire bien; ça serait plutôt V. E. qui voudrait bien le faire.

M. Hachisuka.—Le sens du télégramme à envoyer à S. E. M. Ino-ouyé serait que "le gouvernement français est disposé à faire *retirer* la proposition présentée par M. Sienkiewicz demandant la suppression des droits d'exportation sur les soies, si mon gouvernement m'autorises à faire une déclaration

verbale assurant V. E. que l'abolition de ces droits se fera aussitôt après la conclusion de la Convention, déclaration qui sera confirmée par une note." Dans le cas que ceci se farait, est-ce que ce serait possible de nous entendre.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je ne puis pas encore dire que c'est possible; mais je ne crois pas que c'est impossible. Pour être clair et sans erreur, V. E. voudrait-elle bien rédiger le télégramme et me le montrer pour nous entendre; demain par exemple?

M. Hachisuka.—Alors je rédigerais le télégramme et je viendrais m'entendre avec V. E. Dans le cas que nous arriverons ainsi à une entente, V. E. serait-elle bien disposée à faire retirer la proposition française, à accepter notre mémorandum comme bases de négociations et à envoyer les pleins pouvoirs de signer la convention à M. Sienkiewicz?

M. Jules Ferry.—Oui, oui, certainement oui!

(fin)

## 附圖二

十七年十一月六日佛外務卿談話書

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 三三六

Procès-verbal de l'entrevue de S. E. M. Hachisuka, Ministre du Japon à Paris, avec S. E. M. Jules Ferry, Président du Conseil et Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France.

Paris le 6 novembre, 1884.

M. Hachisuka.—Voici le projet du télégramme que j'ai rédigé pour être adressé à S. E. M. Inouyé:

Projet.

"J'ai eu une entrevue avec le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères; je lui ai exposé vos instructions; mais il maintient sa demande. Après échange confidentiel de vues, il a été décidé que je vous enverrai le télégramme suivant: Le Gouvernement Japonais m'autoriserait à déclarer verbalement et confidentiellement au Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France que l'abolition des droits d'exportation sur les *soie* sera effectuée par notre propre volonté bientôt à près la conclusion de la convention, et cette déclaration sera confirmée par une note éc-

rite de moi de façon que le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères puisse le communiquer confidentiellement à la commission des Chambres lors de la ratification du nouveau traité. *Cette déclaration elle-même ne serait pas un engagement* ; mais son résultat l'abolition effective des droits d'exportation sur les soies, par notre propre volonté, bientôt après la conclusion de la Convention. Si vous acceptez cet arrangement, le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères retirera complètement la demande présentée par le Ministre de France au Japon, acceptera toutes les propositions indiquées dans notre memorandum et enverra les instructions nécessaires et pleins pouvoirs de signer la Convention, par télégraphe, au Ministre de France au Japon. Le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères a vu ce télégramme et l'approuve. Répondez immédiatement. Hachisuka."

M. Jules Ferry.—(après lecture) Dans cette rédaction, il y a le passage :

"Cette déclaration elle-même ne serait pas un engagement." Je ne comprends pas pourquoi V. E.

en profiteront. Nous n'avons jamais demandé de faire cet engagement *uniquement* dans l'intérêt de la France. Il y a encore un autre point qui dit :

"le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères *acceptera toutes* les propositions indiquées dans le memorandum." Je crois que nous pouvons accepter les principaux points mais pas *toutes* les propositions indiquées dans le memorandum. V. E. voudrait-elle bien me laisser ce projet ; j'examinerai ces deux points et je vous en donnerai réponse.

M. Hachisuka.—Parfaitement. Je répéterai encore à V. E. que ce projet n'est qu'un arrangement que nous proposerons pour aboutir à une entente ; ce n'est nullement le Gouvernement Japonais qui le propose ; nous ne savons donc pas si mon gouvernement l'accepterait ou non.

(fin)

通譯神川

十七年十二月十二日佛外務卿談話會

Procès verbal de l'entrevue de

S. E. M. Hachisuka, Ministre du

Japon à Paris, avec S. E. M.

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三三六

vent adopter cette formule ; cette formule serait contradictoire car cette déclaration aurait un résultat effectif ; elle *engagerait* le Japon à abolir effectivement ses droits d'exportation sur les soies. Ce serait toujours un engagement sous une forme ou sous une autre. Je ne pourrai donc pas accepter cette formule.

M. Hachisuka.—Dans le cas que cela deviendrait un engagement, je ne pourrai pas envoyer ce télégramme. La déclaration que je proposerai à mon gouvernement serait tout simplement de *faire savoir* à V. E. que le Gouvernement Japonais a pris la résolution d'abolir ces droits de sa propre volonté. Nous la ferons savoir à la France parce qu'elle demanderait la savoir. Si c'est un *engagement spécial* avec la France, nous ne pourrions pas le faire ; car tout ce que nous négocions, c'est pour tous les pays d'Europe en général ; nous ne pouvons pas faire une exception *spéciale* pour la France.

M. Jules Ferry.—Nous ne demandons pas une *exception spéciale* pour la France ; si le Japon abolit les droits d'exportation sur les *soies*, tous les pays

Jules Ferry, Président du Conseil et Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de France.

Paris le 12 Novembre 1884.

M. Hachisuka.—Est-ce que V. E. est en mesure de me donner réponse au sujet du projet du télégramme ?

M. Jules Ferry.—Il y a cette question de savoir si nous accepterons ou non *tous* les points cités dans votre memorandum ; nous sommes en train de les examiner ; donc nous ne pouvons pas encore en parler à V. E.

M. Hachisuka.—Parfaitement. Mais en dehors de la question signalée par V. E., est-ce que V. E. aurait trouvé un accord ?

M. Jules Ferry.—Je trouve que la formule disant : "Cette déclaration elle-même ne serait pas un engagement" est contradictoire, mais je crois que nous pourrions accepter une *déclaration* qui nous ferait savoir l'intention du Gouvernement Japonais d'abolir spontanément les droits d'exportation sur



les soies dans un délai court, déclaration qui livrait le Gouvernement Japonaise à l'exécution. Quant à la juridiction japonaise sur des questions minimes dans de certains ports, elle nous paraît acceptable. M. Hachisuka.—Alors je reviendrai le mercredi prochain si dici là je n'aurai pas votre réponse. M. Jules Ferry.—Je préviendrai V. E. probablement avant le mercredi prochain.

(fin)

三二七 明治七年二月五日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十七年十二月四日發蜂須賀公使來電

二 十七年十二月三日佛外務卿談話書

内啓緒ハ絹税一件ニ付テハ當佛外務卿佛清事件ニ付キ多務ノ爲メ追々延引相成候處一昨三日面會ノ節兼テ小官ヨリ相渡置候

貴官ハ相呈スベキ電信草稿ニ對シ外務卿ノ考案ヲ加ヘ修正小官ハ相示候ニ付 Basis of negotiation トシテ我覺書承諾ノ趣加ヘ奥度旨申述同卿承諾右相加ヘ候上別紙寫ノ通電

候事ニ御座候何分此上ニモ我ヨリ此事ニ付相望候トモ最早餘程六ツカ數カルベク相考猶御賢考ノ趣モ可有之候得共何トカ歩ミ合ノ御處分第一ト相考御決答相待申候委細ハ別紙佛文小官ト外務卿トノ談話書且右書中電報佛文草稿ニテ宜御承知可被下候昨四日相呈シ候電信則英文ハ右佛文草稿ヲ相譯シ候モノニ御座候

右甲稟ニ及度内啓此如御座候也

十七年十二月五日

巴府ヨリ

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

(追申省略)

附屬書一

十七年十二月四日發蜂須賀公使來電

Copy.

From Hachisuka to Inoue.

Had an interview with Minister for Foreign Affairs. After exchange of views confidentially it has been decided that I send you the following telegram; Japanese government will declare at the conference that they have intention to abolish ulteriorly ex-

井上外務卿時代 對佛交涉 三三十一

信昨四日朝發露國ヲ經テ呈進ニ及候其要點タル外務卿ニ於テ我政府一己ノ考ヲ以絹税ヲ廢スル趣意ハ篤ト了得致シ此上條約重修ノ「コンヂション」トシテ佛政府ヨリ請求ハ致間敷趣ニ候ヘ共此我政府一己ニテ廢スベキ趣且廢止ハ條約重修決約ノ後速ニ必我政府施行スベキ事ヲ小官ヨリ外務卿ニ内告シ且覺書ニテ小官ヨリ右内告ヲ證シ而シテ之ヲ内密新條約批准ノ節佛議院委員會ニ告示スル事必要ナリトノ事ニ有之候加之近日御開キ可相成東京コンフェレンスニテ我政府絹税廢止ノ企有之段議會々員一同ヘ御告示有之度トノ事ニ有之候尤右夫々貴君ニテ御承諾ニ於テハ速ニ在日不佛公使ヘ訓令ヲ發シ我覺書ヲ基礎トシテ商議ノ事新條約ニ調印ノ全權ヲ與フル事絹税廢止ノ請求ハ此上主張致スベカラザル事且我覺書中三四ノ新港ニ於テ外國人ニ適用スベキ制度ノ施行ヲ「コンフェレンス」ニ於テ賛成スルノ權ヲ與フル事夫々取計可申トノ事ニ御座候何十分ノ好結果トハ難申候得共佛政府ハ殊ニ議院ノ委員會ニテ異論ヲ生ズル事ヲ恐レ是非右ノ手續ヲ履ミ絹税ノ廢止ノ事ニ付佛國ノ利害アル事ヲ内密委員會ニ示スニ非レハ批准ノ實行ハレ難クトノ事ニ有之此上小官ニ於テ致方無之不得止別紙ノ通呈電致シ

port duties on silk, Japanese government will authorize me to declare confidentially to French Minister for Foreign Affairs that this suppression should be effected directly after conclusion of commercial convention. This engagement which will have same duration as the duration of the convention will be confirmed by written note from me so that Minister for Foreign Affairs can communicate it confidentially to committee of French Chambers at the time of ratification of new treaty. If you accept this arrangement Minister for F. A. will send instructions to French Minister in Japan no longer to insist on the insertion, in the convention, of a clause relative to export duties on silk, he will send him also instructions to accept our memorandum as the basis for negotiation and at the same time will send full powers to sign the convention; moreover French Minister in Japan will be authorized to support in the conference that of our propositions of which the object is to make, in three or four ports to be opened for foreign trade, experience of new regime to be

established as to the situation of foreigners. Minister for F. A. has seen this telegram and approved it. Reply as soon as possible.

Dec. 4, 1884.

密國轉刊

十中時十門四三四等太英通商條約

Pro-cès-verbal de l'entrevue de  
S. E. M. Hachisuka, Ministre du  
Japon à Paris, avec S. E. M. Jules  
Ferry, Président du Conseil et  
Ministre des Affaires Etrangères  
de France.

Paris le 3 Décembre 1884.

M. Jules Ferry.—Voici le projet du télégramme que j'ai rédigé d'après le vôtre et qui est destiné à être envoyé par V. E. à S. E. M. Ino-ouyé, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères à Tokio :

“J'ai eu une entrevue avec le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, et je lui ai exposé vos instructions, mais il maintient sa demande. Après échange confidentiel de vues, il a été décidé que je vous

enverrais le télégramme suivant :

Le Gouvernement Japonais déclarerait à la conférence qu'il a l'intention d'abolir ultérieurement le droit d'exportation sur les soies, et il m'autoriserait à déclarer confidentiellement au Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de France que cette suppression serait effectuée aussitôt après la conclusion de la Convention Commerciale. Cet engagement, qui aurait la même durée que la Convention, serait confirmé par une note écrite de moi, de façon que le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères puisse le communiquer confidentiellement aux commissions des Chambres, lors de la ratification du nouveau traité.

Si vous acceptez cet arrangement, le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères adressera des instructions au Ministre de France à Tokio pour ne pas insister sur l'insertion, dans la convention, d'une clause relative au droit sur les Soies ; il lui enverra, en même temps, pleins pouvoirs pour signer la convention commerciale. De plus, M. Sienkiewicz serait autorisé à appuyer dans la conférence celle des

propositions du memorandum dont l'objet serait

de faire, dans trois ou quatre ports à ouvrir, à cet effet, au commerce étranger, l'expérience du nouveau régime à établir quant à la situation des étrangers.

Le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères à vu ce télégramme et l'approuve.  
Repondez immédiatement.”

M. Hachisuka.—Dans ce projet je vois que V. E. n'a pas parlé de ce que le gouvernement français accepterait notre memorandum comme *bases de négociations*. Nous y tenons beaucoup ; car sans cette acception on ne pourrait pas ouvrir la conférence.

M. Jules Ferry.—Cela vas sans dire car je dis que j'enverrai les *pleins pouvoirs* à M. Sienkiewicz, je crois que c'est absolument inutile ; cela serait un pléonasme ; mais rien n'empêche que V. E. l'ajoute ; toutefois je lui ferai observer que *accepter* votre memorandum comme *bases de négociation* n'impliquerait pas l'accepter en entier ; cela voudrait dire que l'on l'accepterait comme *bases de discussions*, sauf des modifications ultérieures qui

pourrait résulter de la conférence.

M. Hachisuka.—Certainement. (Il ajoute dans le projet le passage suivant :

“Il acceptera notre memorandum comme bases de négociations et lui (à M. Sienkiewicz) enverra les pleins pouvoirs pour signer &c. &c.”)

M. Jules Ferry.—Oui, très bien.

(fin)

三三八 明治十七年十二月三十日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出税廢止ニ關スル件

附屬書 十二月二十五日發蜂須賀公使來電

内啓者、昨二十四日佛外務卿請日ニ付面會致候處絹税一件  
小官ヨリ本月四日附呈シ候電報ニ掲載有之通り  
貴官、在日本佛公使ノ間御談話行届キ満足存ズルトノ話  
ニ付夫ハ幸ノ事ニ存シ候乍去小官ハ未ダ何事モ右ニ付承知  
不致候旨相答置申候彌小官ヨリ相呈シ候電報ニ有之アレハ  
チメントニ御異議ナクシヤンキウイツ氏ハ御決答相成候事  
哉拜承致シ度則別紙寫ノ通電報今二十五日相呈シ申候

朝鮮事件ニ付テハ過ル十八日當府伊國大使館夜會ニテ佛外務卿へ出會ノ節如何ナル報知有リシ哉トノ尋ニ付朝鮮ニ於テ内亂起リ閔氏始五六人政府ノ人暗殺セラレタル由並ニ日本公使館付護衛兵ト支那兵ト小戰爭有之シ由ノ電報相達シ候得共委曲ハ何分不分明ノ趣相答置申候然ル處其後貴官特命全權大使ニ認ゼラレ不月二十一日朝鮮へ向ケ高島中將樺山少將其他ト共ニ御出發ノ趣貴電信拜受依テ即日佛外務卿公然トナク小官直翰ヲ以其旨通知致置候處昨二十四日面會ノ節右小官ヨリ速ニ通知致シ候事至極滿悦ノ體ニテ挨拶有之候。

右條々申上置候也

巴里ヨリ

茂 詔

外務卿閣下

(追書省略)

註 1 前掲三三七附屬書一 2 本號附屬書參看

附屬書

十七年十二月二十五日發蜂須賀公使來電  
From Hachisuka to Inouye.

院ニテ如何可相決哉何共前知難致事ニ有之(欄外註、此出兵費ハ即今ノ内閣ノ考ニテハ之ヲ要セズ其時迄ニハ總テ東京地方占有シ終リ其上費用ヲ要セズトノ考ト存候得共此目的彌達スル哉否ハ何トモ不被計一論題ト相成可申哉ト存候)萬一フェレー氏内閣變換等ノ事ニ相成候時ハ又絹稅ノ談判端ヲ改メズンバ談決如何ト心配致シ隨テ追々遷延ノ患ヲ生シ可申相恐候ニ付則別紙ノ通一昨二十一日拙電相呈シ申候御多忙中ヲ不顧カ如ク相運ヒ候得共不得止事情宜御洞察ノ程奉希候

先ツ差當リ他ニ至急申稟ノ件モ無之此段計申上留候也

十八年一月二十三日

巴里ヨリ

茂 詔 拜

外務卿閣下

猶々近時當佛外務卿フェレー氏ト小官トノ間交誼追々親密ニ相赴キ萬事都合宜候ニ付此段ハ御安心奉希候也

註 1 夫々三三七附屬書一及三三八附屬書來電參照

附屬書

十八年一月二十一日發蜂須賀公使來電

From Hachisuka to Inouye.

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 三三〇

French Minister for Foreign Affairs stated to me he has received from French Minister in Japan communication that silk duty question has been settled between you and French Minister in Japan accordance with my telegram of 4 instant. Answer by telegram whether you have accepted all arrangements mentioned in my telegram.

Dec. 25, 1884.

三二九

明治十六年二月三日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出稅廢止ニ關スル件

附屬書 一月二十一日發蜂須賀公使來電

(前略)

絹輸出稅一條ニ付テハ舊臘四日二十五日兩度拙電相呈候處其後御留守ニテ未ダ御返電無之事奉存候得共如此事件ハ其機會ヲ外サズ御決定ノ事必要ト相考殊ニ當佛内閣モ今日ノ儘永續ノ見込有之候得ハ左ノ御急キニモ及間敷哉ニ候得共即今佛政府ノ發議中スクリウタン、ド、リス、トノ事アリ且當六月下院改選迄ニハ本年半季ノ東京出兵費ノ事等當議

I am waiting reply to my telegrams of 4 and 25 ultimo in reference to the question of duties on silk; I recommend you to decide it and telegraph me as soon as possible because ministerial changes here may take place at any moment although there is no sign up to the present.

21 January, 1885.

三三〇

明治十六年二月七日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

絹輸出稅廢止ニ關スル件

附屬書一 十八年二月二十二日到外務卿往電

二 十八年二月二十六日發外務卿宛來電

三 十八年二月二十五日佛國外務卿宛談話書

拜啓絹稅一條ニ付過ル二十二日別紙甲號寫ノ通貴電信拜受依テ翌二十三日小官直翰ニ添ヘ貴電信寫外務卿フェレー氏へ相送り置而シテ二十五日同卿請日ニ付面會別紙佛文談話書ニ掲載ノ通談話致シ候依テ昨二十六日猶又別紙乙號寫ノ通拙電信相呈シ御返電相待居中候外務卿ニ於テハ此度ノ貴電信ニ付テハ深満足ノ様子言辭ニ相顯レ申候

一昨二十五日夜伊藤參議特派全權大使ニ命セラレ西郷參議

一〇五九

ト同行清國へ二十七日出發ノ趣貴電報相受新聞紙へ掲載ノ事モ西郷氏云々ヲ除キ今二十七日發兌ルタヘ新聞へ掲載ノ管命シ置申候當時本邦ニテハ清國ト開戦ノ説頗ル盛シナル哉ト想察當府在留ノ本邦人中ニモボツ々々同説ヲ唱フルモノ有之哉ニ相考候乍去今般伊藤大使發向ハ全ク平和ノ談判ニ歸スルノ御決議ヨリ出デ候事小官ニ於テ最賛成スル所ニ有之候此上談判ノ趣ニ寄り不得止時ハ開戦セザルベカラズト存候得共日不全國今日ノ形況ニ對シ且條約改正モ殆メド成ラントスルノ今日開戦ハ決テ好ムベカラズ其機ハ必後年ニ可有之存候敬具、

明治十八年二月二十七日 巴府ニテ

茂 韶

外務卿閣下

(追甲省略)

附屬書一

甲號 十八年二月二十二日對外務卿往電

From Inouye to Hachisuka.

I had an interview with reference to silk question and have agreed on following arrangement: at the end of next conference Japan will make declaration

to abolish from her free will export duties on silk to take effect from date when convention is to come into effect. I will also before opening of conference write confidential communication to the French Minister that said export duties will remain abolished during period for which new convention is to continue. The French Minister has expressed his full satisfaction with this arrangement and I trust French government will concur with their representative in considering this act of Japan as evidence of friendship and good will towards Republic. You are instructed to show this telegram to Minister for Foreign Affairs and request him that, in view of this arrangement, I desire that he will lose no time in expressing his readiness to proceed with negotiation on the basis of our memorandum and to send to the French Minister full powers to negotiate, conclude and sign convention.

22 Feb., 1885

附屬書二

乙號 十八年二月二十六日發外務卿宛來電

From Hachisuka to Inouye.

negotiate, conclude and sign Convention.

26 Feb., 1885.

附屬書三

十八年二月二十五日佛國外務卿談話書

巴里駐劄日本國公使蜂須賀氏佛國內閣長兼外務卿ジエルフエリー閣下ト應接ノ筆記

シエル、フエリー氏 生糸輸出税廢止ノ件新規取定ノ義ニ付井上伯ノ電報ニ關スル貴翰正ニ領收致候

蜂須賀氏 右ノ電報有之候上ハ閣下ヨリ在東京佛國公使シエンキークウキツ氏ハ早速全權ヲ御送付相成候義ト確信致候ジエル、フエリー氏 拙者ハ此結果ニ付甚タ満足致候是ハ客年來貴我相互熟議ノ結果ニ有之候然レトモシエンキークウキツ氏ハ全權ヲ送與スル前ニ閣下ニ御注意セサルヲ不得事ニ項有之候第一、會議中井上、シエンキークウキツノ兩氏ハ如何ノ振合ヲ取ラレ候哉ヲ承知致度事ニ有之候何トナレハ井上氏ハ該會議ノ終末ニ發議相成ルヘキ筈ニ有之候ハナリ我公使ハ該件ニ關シテロヲ開カサル事ニ候哉然ル時ハ甚タ可笑キ事ト被存候何トナレハ佛國カ該要求ヲ爲シタル事ハ世人ノ既ニ知ル所ニ有之候ハナリ或ハ井上氏ノ爲ニ棄

拒セラル、ヲ承知シナカラシエンキーウエツ氏ヨリ該税廢止ヲ請求スヘキ事ニ候哉然レハ一戲劇ヲ演スルニ異ナラサルヘシ故ニ井上伯ノ發議ハ會議ノ初端若クハ税目ノ討議ニ着手スルノ時ニ於テセラル、方可然ト存候

蜂須賀氏 御注意ノ趣旨ハ了悉致候電報ヲ以テ我政府ハ通知可致候

ジユル、フェリー氏 最好、尙又余ノ注意第二項ハ貴方ノ覺書ヲ談判ノ基礎トシテ承認スルト申ス主意ハ談書中ニ記載アル各點ヲ渾テ承認スルノ意味ニ無之唯論議ノ起程即チ討議ノ基礎トシテ之ヲ承認スルノ意ニ有之候何トナレハ該覺書中ニハ注意ヲ要スヘキ條項夥多可有之様相見ヘ候ハナリ

蜂須賀氏 談判ノ字ハ討議ノ意ヲ含有スルモノト存候右御注意ノ廉モ井上氏ヘ指示可致候閣下右御注意ノ二項ニ對スル井上伯ノ回答ヲ御接手相成候上ハ直ニ條約ヲ談判決定調印スルノ全權ヲシエンキーウヤツ氏ニ御送與相成御所存ニ候哉

ジユル、フェリー氏 素ヨリ然リ右全權ハ送付可致候(畢)  
千八百八十五年二月二十五日 巴里ニ於テ

## 右原文

Procès-verbal de l'entrevue de M.

Hachisuka, Ministre du Japon à Paris, avec S. E. M. Jules Ferry, Président du Conseil et Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de France.

Paris le 25 Février 1885.

M. Jules Ferry.—J'ai parfaitement reçu votre lettre relative au télégramme du Comte Ino-ouyé, à propos du nouvel arrangement sur la question de l'abolition des droits d'exportation sur les soies.

M. Hachisuka.—Par suite de ce télégramme, je ne doute pas que V. E. ne soit disposée à envoyer immédiatement les pleins pouvoirs à M. Sienkiewicz, Ministre de France à Tokio.

M. Jules Ferry.—Je suis très satisfait de ce résultat; c'est le résultat de notre travail mutuel depuis l'année dernière, mais avant d'envoyer les pleins pouvoirs à M. Sienkiewicz, je trouve devoir faire à V. E. deux observations. La 1<sup>re</sup> observation est de savoir quelle attitude doivent prendre M.

Ino-ouyé et M. Sienkiewicz dans le cours de la conférence, puisque la déclaration de M. Ino-ouyé no doit avoir lieu qu'à la fin de la conférence.

Est-ce que notre représentant tiendrait la bouche fermé sur cette question? Cela serait alors très drôle car tout le monde sait que la France a fait cette réclamation. M. Sienkiewicz demanderait-il l'abolition de ces droits pour se voir refuser par M. Ino-ouyé? Cela semblerait jouer de la comédie. Je crois qu'il vaut mieux que la déclaration ait lieu au commencement de la conférence, ou au moment même où l'on toucherait à la discussion du tarif.

M. Hachisuka.—Je comprends parfaitement cette observation; je la ferai savoir à mon gouvernement par télégraphe.

M. Jules Ferry.—Très bien; maintenant ma seconde observation consiste à savoir que *accepter* votre memorandum comme bases de négociations ne signifie pas *accepter en bloc* tous les points mentionnés dans ce memorandum, mais veut dire seulement l'accepter comme points de départ ou plutôt

comme *bases de discussions*, car, dans ce memorandum, il me semble qu'il y a beaucoup de points sur lesquels il y a des observations à faire.

M. Hachisuka.—Je crois que le mot *negotiation* implique la *discussion*. Je signalerai aussi cette observation à M. Ino-ouyé.

Si V. E. obtient la réponse du Comte Ino-ouyé sur ces deux observations, est-ce qu'Elle serait disposée à envoyer de suite à M. Sienkiewicz les pouvoirs de négociier, conclure et signer la Convention.

M. Jules Ferry.—Parfaitement, je les enverrai.  
(fin)

三三三 明治十八年五月八日

蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 絹輸出税廢止ノ件

附屬書一 十八年五月六日附佛國外務卿宛往翰

二 十八年五月二日到外務卿往電

(絹輸出税廢止問題ニ關スル件)

拜啓者、絹税一條ニ付御往復ヲ重ネ候後過ル一二日貴電報<sup>1</sup>接

手依テ過ル六日水曜日外務卿請日ニ付外務省へ相越候處生憎面會ヲ不得依テ同夕小官自筆書翰別紙寫ノ通り申入置候尤二日接手ノ貴電報寫之ニ相添申候外務省商務局長クランレー氏ハ其前面會疾ト當方ノ意相通シ置申候今日ニテハ最早佛政府異議ノケ條ハ總テ消滅候ニ付全權ヲ在日本佛公使へ送り候事多分不日相行ハレ候事ト頻ニ希望致シ候  
(以下略)

十八年五月八日

巴里ヨリ

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

註 一 附屬書ニ往電ナルニ付參看

## 附屬書一

十八年五月六日附佛國外務卿宛往翰

Paris le 6 mai 1885.

M. le Ministre,

Je viens de recevoir du Comte Ino-ouyé, notre Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, le télégramme ci-inclus relativement à la question des droits d'exportation sur les soies.

Comme cet arrangement a réglé toutes les objections conformément au désir de votre gouvernement,

je prierais V. E. de vouloir bien envoyer les pleins pouvoirs de négocier sur les bases de notre memorandum, conclure et signer la Convention, à M. Sienkiewicz, et d'en avertir ce dernier par voie télégraphique.

J'en ai parlé avec M. Clavery aujourd'hui ; je serai très reconnaissant à V. E. de vouloir bien me donner votre réponse le plus tôt qu'il vous serait possible.

Veuillez.....

M. Hachisuka

S. E.

M. de Pereyinet

Ministre des Affaires Etrangères

Paris

## 附屬書二

十八年五月二日到外務卿往電

(箱輸出税廢止問題ニ關スル件)

Received the 2nd May 1885.

Hachisuka

From Gaimukio. Between French Minister and

拜啓者ハ絹類税一件ニ付過ル八日呈書後翌九日外務省商務局長クランレー氏ヨリ別紙甲號寫ノ通書翰到來候ニ付別紙乙號寫ノ通電報相呈シ申候來ル二十二日ニハ必在日本佛公使へ全權委任狀送出可相成候得共猶彌ノ處承合次第呈電ノ考ニ御座候也

十八年五月十五日

巴里

茂 韶 拜

外務卿閣下

猶々東京決議會御開設前小官ヨリ佛政府へ公然トナク覺書ト差出候義ニ付御訓令奉待候也

## 附屬書一

甲號 十八年五月九日附佛外務卿商務局長來翰

Paris le 9 mai 1885.

Monsieur le Marquis,

Je m'empresse de vous faire savoir, de la part de S. E. M. le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, que le télégramme anonçant à M. Sienkiewicz l'envoi des pleins pouvoirs, a été expédié hier soir. Ces pleins pouvoirs seront transmis par la prochaine valise, c'est-à-dire le 22 mai.

Hanabusa.

三三三 明治十六年五月十五日 蜂須賀駐佛公使ヨリ  
井上外務卿宛

## 在本邦佛國公使へノ全權委任狀ノ件

附屬書一 十八年五月九日附佛外務省商務局長來翰

二 十八年五月九日發蜂須賀公使來電

井上外務卿時代 對佛交渉 三三三

Veillez.....

Clavery

Directeur des Affaires  
Commerciales

S. E.

M. le Marquis Hachisuka  
&c. &c. &c.

附屬書二

乙號 十八年五月九日發蜂須賀公使來電

(佛國在本邦公使ハノ全權委任方ニ關スル件)

Telegram sent 9 May 1885.

Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tokio.

Minister for Foreign Affairs has informed me he has telegraphed last evening to French Minister at Tokio announcing that full powers to negotiate on the basis of our Memorandum and to sign the Convention will be sent by French mail leaving 22 instant. Will you telegraph me the date of opening of conference in order that I may write before opening of conference confidential note to Minister for Foreign Affairs according to the text contained in your telegram 2 instant.

Hachisuka.

三三三 明治十九年五月三日

佛國公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

絹輸出税廢止宣言ノ件

外務大臣井上伯閣下

シエンキエウキツ

絹糸税廢止ノ儀ハ會議開始ノ際御明言可相成筈ニ御約束有之候處此儀ニ付我政府ヨリ問合有之候間右ハ五月一日ヨリ會議開始相成候ニ付本月二十二日ノ發會ニ閣下御明言可相成筈ニ有之候旨電信ヲ以テ回報可致積ニ御座候  
右ノ趣旨蜂須賀侯ヨリモ我政府ハ御申通相成候様御取計被下候ハノ幸甚ニ存候敬具

千八百八十六年五月三日

欄外註

本件ノ回答ハ大臣御面談ニテ事濟タリ

(右原文)

Le 3 Mai 1886.

Mon cher Comte,

Interrogé par mon Gouvernement au sujet de la

déclaration concernant l'abolition ultérieure des

droits sur les soies que Votre Excellence s'est engagée à faire au début des délibérations de la conférence, je répondrai par le télégraphe que la conférence s'étant constituée le 1<sup>er</sup> Mai c'est à l'ouverture de la séance du 22 de ce mois que Votre Excellence fera la déclaration dont il s'agit.

Je serais, d'ailleurs, très reconnaissant à Votre Excellence si Elle voulait bien prier M. le Marquis Hachisouka de s'exprimer dans le même sens.

Veuillez agréer, Mon cher Comte, l'assurance de ma très haute considération.

Sinkiewicz

Son Excellence

Monsieur le Comte Ino-ouyé

Ministre d'Etat, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères

三三四 明治十九年五月十四日

原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

絹輸出税廢止宣言ノ件

附屬書一 十九年四月二十八日蜂須賀公使ヨリ佛外務

大臣宛往翰

井上外務大臣時代 對佛交涉 三三四

二 十九年五月六日佛外務大臣返翰

三 十九年五月十日井上外務大臣往電

機密 第二十四號

六月廿五日到

生糸輸出税廢止ノ儀ニ付當國外務大臣ハ機密信ヲ以テ通知可致旨電報ヲ以テ蜂須賀公使ハ訓令相成候ニ付同公使ヨリ別紙甲號ノ通申送り同時ニ口上ニテモ其趣旨通知相成候所別紙乙號ノ通回答有之候然ルニ一昨日丙號ノ電報接手小官ニ於テハ何分了解難致多分在西班牙蜂須賀公使ヨリ直接往復相成居ル事ト存候ニ付當國外務大臣ハ可申入様トノ語辭モ相見得候ハ共其マ、蜂須賀公使ハ轉送致電候間同公使ヨリ諸事御回答可相成存候  
右申進候也

明治十九年五月十四日

在佛國

臨時代理公使 原

散(印)

外務大臣伯爵井上馨殿

註 1 「機密信ヲ以テ通知可致旨」ノ電報見當ラズ

附屬書一

甲號 明治十九年四月二十八日蜂須賀公使ヨリ佛國外務大臣宛往翰

機密

佛國外務大臣

在巴里日本特命全權公使

フレーシネー閣下

蜂須賀茂韶手記

以書翰致啓上候陳者我帝國政府ニ於テ目下談判中ナル新條約實施ノ上ハ絹糸輸出稅ヲ廢シ該條約ノ行ハルノ間ハ直接間接ニ論ナク該稅ヲ不取立而テ右絹糸ナル語ハ等ク蠶繭生糸絹布ニ通シテ用ユヘキ我政府ノ意ニ有之候旨内密ニ閣下ニ可致御通知旨井上伯ヨリ通報到來致候  
新條約決議ノ會ハ五月一日東京ニ於テ開カルノ都合ニ有之候ニ付テハ客歲閣下ト拙者トノ間ニ取極メタル趣意ニ隨ヒ右開會前ニ前顯決定ノ次第ヲ閣下ニ可及御通知旨拙者ハテ命相成候敬具

千八百八十六年四月二十八日

(右原文)

Paris le 28 Avril 1886.

Son Excellence Monsieur de Freycient

Ministre des Affaires Étrangères.

Confidentielle

Monsieur le Ministre,

Je viens de recevoir du Comte Inouye un télé-

日本特命全權公使侯爵

在巴里

蜂須賀茂韶閣下

フレーシネー手記

謹啓陳者貴政府ニ於テ現今談判中ナル新條約實施ノ上ハ絹糸輸出稅ヲ廢シ該條約ノ行ハルノ間ハ直接間接ニ論ナク該稅ヲ不被取立而テ右絹糸ナル語ハ等ク蠶繭生糸絹布ニ通シテ可被用貴政府ノ御意ニ有之候旨内密ニ拙者ニ御通知相成候儀貴政府ヨリ閣下へ許可有之候旨客月二十八日附貴信ヲ以テ御中越ノ趣致承知候右御通知相成候段致鳴謝候即御申越ノ趣ハ四月三十日附電報ヲ以テ在東京我共和國特命全權公使ニ及通知候ニ付御通知ノ次第ハ委細領承致候旨貴政府へ御通知相成度奉希望候  
本件ニ付舊日御協議ニ及ヒ千八百八十四年十二月閣下ヨリ井上外務大臣宛電報相成候通り「新條約」ノ文字ハ貿易上ノ事項ニ關スル條款ニモ適用スル事勿論ニ有之候此段得貴意候敬具

千八百八十六年五月六日

(右原文)

Paris le 6 Mai 1886.

Monsieur le Ministre Hachisuka.

井上外務大臣時代 對佛交渉 三三四

gramme qui me donne l'ordre d'informer confidentiellement Votre Excellence que le Gouvernement Impérial abolira les droits d'exportation sur les soies au moment de la mise en vigueur des nouvelles Conventions qui sont actuellement en négociation, que ces droits ne seront pas rétablis, directement ou indirectement, pendant la durée des nouvelles Conventions, et que par le mot "soies" mon Gouvernement entend les cocons, la soie brute, la soie grège, et la soie fabriquée.

La Conférence pour l'achèvement des nouvelles Conventions doit se réunir à Tokio le 1 Mai; je suis chargé, par conséquent, conformément aux arrangements pris l'année dernière entre Votre Excellence et moi, de porter cette décision à la connaissance de Votre Excellence avant la réunion de la Conférence.

&c.

signé Hachisuka.

附圖二

ニ號 十九年五月六日附佛國外務大臣返書

Ministre du Japon à Paris.

Monsieur le Marquis,

Par une lettre en date du 28 du mois dernier vous avez bien voulu me faire connître que vous étiez autorisé par votre Gouvernement à m'informer confidentiellement que le Gouvernement Japonais abolira les droits d'exportation sur les soies au moment de la mise en vigueur des nouvelles Conventions qui sont actuellement en négociation, que ces droits ne seront pas rétablis, directement ou indirectement, pendant la durée des nouvelles Conventions, et que par le mot "soies" le Gouvernement Impérial entend les cocons, la soie grège, et la soie fabriquée.

En vous remerciant de cette communication, dont j'ai d'ailleurs donné connaissance au Ministre de la République à Tokio, le 30 Avril par voie télégraphique, je vous prierai, Monsieur le Marquis, de vouloir bien faire savoir à votre Gouvernement que j'ai pris acte de la déclaration qu'elle contient.

Il est, d'ailleurs, bien entendu qu'en conformité de l'accord qui s'est établi antérieurement sur ce



sujet, et qui a fait l'objet du télégramme que vous avez adressé à Mr. Inoué au mois de décembre 1884, le terme de "nouvelles Conventions" s'applique aux stipulations relatives au régime commercial.

&c.

signé Freycinet.

附屬書三

丙號 十九年五月十日附井上外務大臣往電

From Inouye to Hachisuka

You may tell French Minister for Foreign Affairs that silk duty will be abolished at the same time when the new convention goes into effect &c. as per my telegram of April 26, but not after the conference as per your telegram of 8 instant. My object in last telegram is to do away with announcement on my part at this conference for reasons stated in my last telegram. If, however, this is impossible, promise French Minister for Foreign Affairs in my name that, after the Conference has settled the question of tariff, I will make a declaration that Japanese Government is free to diminish or abolish any export duty. Try to accomplish

this as soon as possible.

10 May 1886.

三三五 明治十九年五月二十日

原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

絹税廢止宣言ノ件

附屬書一

十九年五月十四日附原代理公使宛往電

二 十九年五月十七日發原代理公使來電

三 十九年五月十九日佛外務省通商局長ヨリノ

覺書

四 十九年五月十九日發原代理公使來電

機密 第二十五號

七月三日

生糸輸出税廢止ノ義ニ付別紙甲號ノ通十九日迄ニ遅クトモ御回答可申進旨去十四日發貴電接手致候然ルニ去十四日附機密第二十四號ヲ以テ申進候通露京經由ノ電報ハ蜂須賀公使出先キニ於テ接手ノ都合ニ取計候ト見候小官ニ於テハ何分先後ノ成行了解不致依テ直チニ在西班牙蜂須賀公使ハ轉電致候同公使ヨリ往復電報并同公使ヨリ當國外務大臣ハ出先キヨリ直接ニ差出シタル書翰寫トモ追々接到致候ニ付去ル十七日當國外務省通商局長クラヴリー氏ニ面會イタシ訓

電ノ趣旨ニ基キ申談候所來ル十九日ニ佛政府確定ノ返答可致トノ事ニ付其旨即日乙號寫ノ通電報ヲ以テ上申イタシ且ツ談話ノ模様ニ付見込ヲモ申進シ尙又去十九日前約ノ通クラヴリー氏ニ面會致確定ノ返答承リ候所別紙丙號ノ覺書ヲ示シ候ニ付當方ヨリモ訓令ノ趣旨ニ基キ尙申入候所元來生糸輸出税廢止ノ事ヲ會議ニ向テ井上伯ヨリ言明セラルノ事ハ先年中商議相整ヒ既ニ他國政府ヘモ其旨告ケ置キタル事ニ付全ク此件ヲ拋棄致ス事ハ難相成乍去日本政府ノ便利ノ爲メニ箇ノ意見ヲ提出可致ニ付其内ノ一ヲ御撰擇相成度尤モ此義ニ付テハ直チニ在東京佛國公使ハ電報可致ニ付同公使ト御協定有之度トノ趣ニテ結局丁號電文記載ノ要旨ニ歸着致候ニ付即日其旨電報ヲ以テ具申致候此段及具報候也

明治十九年五月廿一日

在佛國

臨時代理公使 原

敬(印)

外務大臣伯爵井上馨殿

附屬書一

甲號 十九年五月十四日附原代理公使宛往電

From Inouye to Hara.

井上外務大臣時代 對佛交渉 三三五

Before the meeting of the Conference on 22

Japanese Government desire to settle the subject of my telegram of 6 instant. Consult with French Minister for Foreign Affairs at once and reply by 19 at the latest.

May 14, 1886.

註 一 五月六日外務大臣發ノ電報見當ナシ

附屬書二

乙號 十九年五月十七日發原代理公使來電

From Hara to Inouye.

I shall receive on 19 May in the morning definite answer of French Minister for Foreign Affairs about declaration of abolition of export duty on silk. He has serious objections to the total suppression of a declaration. I hope to telegraph on 19 May that an arrangement is made of a kind to satisfy you.

May 17, 1886.

附屬書三

丙號 十九年五月十九日佛國外務省通商局長ヨリノ覺書

J'ai fait connaître au Ministre des Affaires Etrangères que le Gouvernement Japonais attacherait

un grand intérêt à être dispensé de déclarer à la Conférence son intention d'abolir les droits de sortie sur les soies. J'ai ajouté que vous desireriez pouvoir tout au moins vous borner à déclarer, au moment du règlement de la question de tarif, que le Japon sera libre de diminuer ou d'abolir les droits d'exportation de toute nature.

Mr. de Freycinet m'a répondu qu'une déclaration est nécessaire, mais que le Gouvernement de la République consent à ce que le Cabinet de Tokio, après entente avec le Ministre de France au Japon, ajourne, s'il y a lieu, jusqu'à la dernière séance, la déclaration convenue en décembre 1884, ou, y substitue, si les circonstances paraissent à Mr. Sienkiewicz pouvoir s'y prêter, la déclaration générale que nous proposons actuellement. Il est bien entendu que, dans tous les cas, l'engagement pris vis à vis de la France par le Japon et constaté dans les lettres que j'ai échangées avec Mr. de Freycinet les 28 Avril et 6 Mai derniers, demeure intact.

Des instructions télégraphiques concues dans les termes qui précèdent viennent d'être adressées par

Mr. de Freycinet à son Représentant à Tokio.

附屬書四

一號 十九年五月十九日發原代理公使來電

From Hara to Inoue.

French Minister for Foreign Affairs states that it is not possible for him to consent to an entire abandonment of a declaration at the Conference, because, when you accepted in spring last year to make a declaration, the French Government informed this fact to the Powers and would therefore place itself in a false position, if it now consented to suppress the declaration altogether. But, desirous of meeting your views, French Minister for Foreign Affairs consents to one of the following solutions:—

Either you would postpone till the last sitting of Conference, after all is finished, specific declaration as stated in telegrams from Hachisuka to you of 22 and 26 February last year and in your telegram of 27 April last year; or you would make a general declaration as proposed in your telegrams of 7 and 10 instant. But French Minister for Foreign Affairs reserves expressly for the French Minister in Japan

right of approving your choice between these two solutions. It will be necessary for you to come to an understanding with him before deciding. Analogous telegram is sent to-day by French Minister for Foreign Affairs to French Minister in Japan.

May 19, 1886.

### 三三六

明治三年二月二十二日 原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

#### 佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件

附屬書 二十年一月十九日發原代理公使來電

(佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件)

機密 第四號

三月五日到

去十八日當國外務大臣フロランス氏ヨリ明十九日午後(外交官面會ノ例日)拙官ニ面會致度旨屬官ヲ以テ申越候ニ付即チ同日外務省ニ赴キ面會致候所條約改正案中英語ヲ法廷ノ官語トナスヘキ件ニ付概略左ノ通談話有之候

外務大臣云 今日御招キ致シタルハ餘ノ義ニアラス條約改正會議ニ關シ我公使サンキウイツ氏ヨリ得タル報告閱スルニ英語ヲ法廷ノ官語トスルノ件アリ此義ニ付テハ我公使ハ

一應ハ異議ヲ提出致シタル由ナルガ我佛國ハ東洋ニ於テ他國ト共ニ多少ノ利益ヲ有シ又日本國ニハ殊ニ親密ノ交際ヲナシ居ル事ナレハ英語ノミヲ法廷ニ採用セラル、事ハ何分解シ難キ事ニ付貴下ヨリ説明ヲ得タキ次第ニ候  
拙官云 此義ニ付テハ今日マテ訓令ハ勿論未タ會議録ヲモ接手致サス候ニ付遺憾ナカラ其理由ヲ説明致ス事能ハス然シナカラ御談話ノ趣ハ直チニ電信ヲ以テ井上伯ニ申送り何分ノ回答ヲ求ムヘク候

外務大臣云 然ラハ右様ニ願タシ

拙官云 御談話ノ要點ヲ今一應承ハル事ヲ得ハ幸ニ存候  
外務大臣云 御承知ノ通佛語ハ歐洲ニ於テ最モ廣ク用ラレ居リ又佛國ハ是マテ日本ニ對シテハ最モ親密ノ交際ヲナシ此度ノ改正新案ニモ同僚ト共ニ我公使ヨリ同意ヲ表シタル程ノ次第ナレハ英公使ノ發議ニヨリテ英語ノミヲ法廷ニ採用セラレタルハ遺憾ニ思ハレ候勿論佛國政府ノ希望ハトアレハ「英語ト共ニ佛語モ採用セラレ即チ英佛兩國ヲ法廷ニ採用セラル、事」ニ有之候

拙官云 委細了承致候數日ノ後必ラス井上伯ノ返電ヲ得ヘキニ付尙ホ其上ニテ可申述候

右ニテ終リ雜話ノ後歸館致候要スルニ法律其他ノ事是マテ佛ヨリ採用セラレ居リ候處此度英語ヲ採用セラル、事ニ相成候テハ多少佛國ノ利益及勢力ニ關スル事ト認メ此發議アリタル様相見得候

前陳ノ次第ハ即日電信ヲ以テ別紙寫ノ通申進候ニ付不遠内何分ノ御訓令ヲ得ヘク存候ヘ共不取敢此段申進候敬具

明治二十年一月廿一日

在佛國

原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛  
明治二十年一月二十二日附原代理公使宛往電  
附屬書 (法廷用語ニ英語採用ニ關スル件)

佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件

機密 第七號

三月十六日到

外務大臣伯爵井上馨殿  
追而前陳ノ談話ハ一應ノ問答ニ付別ニ「ノート」様ノモノハ無之候

附屬書

二十年一月十九日發原代理公使來電  
(佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件)

From Hara to Inouye.

French Minister for Foreign Affairs asked me verbally to-day what is the reason of the adoption of English as official language of law court under the proposed arrangements. He claims French

language should be adopted conjointly with English.  
Reply by telegraph.

January 19, 1887.

三三七 明治二十年二月十八日

原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件

附屬書 二十年一月二十二日附原代理公使宛往電  
(法廷用語ニ英語採用ニ關スル件)

機密 第七號

三月十六日到

法廷ニ英語採用ノ義ニ付前便機密第四號<sup>1</sup>ヲ以テ外務大臣フ  
ロランス氏ト談話ノ概要申進置候處去二十二日別紙寫ノ通  
御返電ヲ得尙ホ會議錄第九ヨリ第十一ニ至ルマテ去廿四日  
米國便ヨリ接手致シ事情稍々了解被致候ニ付一昨廿六日外  
務大臣ニ面會致御返電ノ佛譯文ヲ示シ候所右電文ノミニテ  
ハ充分ニ了解難致趣談話ニ付會議錄記載ノ主意ヲ摘示辯明  
致候所同氏ニ於テハ篤ト取調ノ上尙ホ御談話可致トノ事ニ  
付即日通商局長クラヴリイ氏ニ面會致前意ヲ辯明致候所同  
局長ハ未タ本件ノ會議錄ヲ接手致サス只サンキウイツ氏ヨ  
リ入組ミタル書翰ヲ得タルマテト申事ニ付携帯ノ會議錄ヲ

January 22, 1887.

三三八 明治二十年二月十八日

原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

佛語ヲ法廷用語ニ採用方ノ件

機密 第九號

三月三十日到

法廷ニ英語採用ノ義ニ付本年機密第四號并ニ第七號ヲ以テ  
申進置候通辯明ノ末通商局長クラヴリー氏ヘ會議錄貸與イ  
タシ彼方ノ報知相待居候所同局長限リマルシャル氏ヘノ談  
話ニハ右ニ關シテ佛政府ハ異論ノ件々ヲ佛公使ニ訓令シテ  
改正會議ニ再ヒ異議ヲ提出スル事ハ徒ラニ會議ノ混雜ヲ惹  
起スマテニ付見合スヘシ乍去佛政府ハ會議結了ノ後ヲ待テ  
前陳異論ノ件々ヲ提出シテ修正ヲ加フヘキ見込云々ニ有之  
タル趣マルシャル氏ヨリ申出候就テハ差向キ佛國政府ヨリ  
異議ヲ申越候事ハ有之間敷被存候ヘ共改正條約批准ニ際シ  
テハ多少異論可有之存候

右申進候敬具

明治二十年二月十八日

在佛國

From Inouye to Hara.  
The question has been settled already for the reason that English language is spoken by more than three fourth of foreigners in Japan and that it would cause great inconvenience to the tribunal if they were obliged to acknowledge more than one foreign language as official.

井上外務大臣時代 對佛交涉 三三九  
臨時代理公使 原 敬  
外務大臣伯爵井上馨殿

三三九 明治三十七年七月二十九日 原駐佛代理公使ヨリ  
井上外務大臣宛

外國籍判事採用ノ件

附屬書 二十年七月六日發原代理公使來電  
(外國籍判事採用方ノ件)

機密 第三十八號 九月十二日到

條約改正後外國籍判事採用ノ件ニ付五月四日附機密送第四四五號貴信<sup>1</sup>去六月十一日接到披見致候右訓令ノ趣旨ニ基キ當國外務省通商局長ヘ内談致彼ニ於テ我意見ノ通承諾スヘキ哉ノ景況略ホ相見得唯サンキウイツ氏ノ申出ニヨリ檢事ヲモ各大國ニ分割スヘキ事ト了解致居候由ニテ此點ニ付尙ホサンキウイツ氏ヘ談話致スヘシト通商局長ノ返答有之候然ルニ其後在伯林公使館ヨリ追々廻送相成候電報寫披見致候所各國ヘ分割ノ人員ハ米國ノ部ニ多少ノ變化有之最初御訓令ノ數ニ幾分ノ變更ヲ生シタル様相見得候ニ付最初御訓令ノ數ヲ以テ引續キ當國政府ヘ談判難致被考候依テ本月六

第四節 對 獨 交 涉

三四〇 明治十三年六月十日 井上外務卿ヨリ  
青木駐獨公使宛

條約改正談判ニツイテ内意通達ノ件

別後船中御差支無之頃日ハ最早桑港ヘ御着併於倫頓府披封被成候事ト奉存候(中略)別封ノ内書ハ夫々ヘモ差遣シ申候御出立頃迄ニハ各政府ノ意見モ夫々粗承リ込候上ニテ草按モ箇條變換ノ手段ニ付略各國政府モ同意ノ場合ニテ全權委員派出迄請求ノ考察ニ有之候得共各政府ノ意見追々ニ聞込夫々隨テ書翰ト電報ニテ應答致候テハ終ニ收束スル處ヲ失シ可中懸念ヲ生シ候故此度ハ斷然草按ノ主義一通リ辯解シ其旨意相貫候上速ニ全權委員派出ヲ請求シ箇條ノ存廢交換等ハ實地ニ付協議ノ上決定致度愚存ニ御座候勿論此度ノ改正事件ハ協議ニ成立セシ事柄故其手段ノ方却テ速ニ相運ヒ可中候尤老兄ト申合置候獨政府自然此草按ヲ一見シ不充分ヲ顯出セシ時老兄ノ御見込策他ト相圖リ純乎トシテアドミニストレチーブノ法ヲ(別限ノ有無ニ不係)吾政府握掌

日別紙寫ノ通電報ヲ以テ更ニ訓令ヲ仰キ候此段事情申進候  
敬具  
明治二十年七月廿九日  
在佛國  
臨時代理公使 原 敬印)

外務大臣伯爵井上馨殿  
註 1 一四八文書ナルニ付參看

附屬書

二十年七月六日發原代理公使來電  
(外國籍判事採用方ノ件)

From Hara to Count Inouye.  
Paris, 6 July 1887.

Have been negotiating about judges with French Government on the basis of 10, 15 and 10, according to your instructions, and had good prospects of success. But news from Berlin leads me to suppose that the number granted to United States may have been changed. If it is true basis becomes modified. I do not venture to continue negotiations without further instructions from you.

スル事件相談相付候ヘハ別テ妙策ニテ充分満足仕候尤東京大阪京都等其代リ開場候事ハ困リ申候爲如何カ彼ノ人力車ミクレーム又ハホリスロー中ノ違徒罪此度ニケ條ノ決末承知致シ吳候ハハ三都ヲ開キ候事ハ充分盡力可仕候尤行政規則ハ立法計ニ無之ヲ裁判スル權迄ヲ範メタル事ニ御座候何分ニモ獨政府ヲシテ最初ノスリ臺ニ致シ候様速ニ方向ヲ付各全權委員ヲ差出シ其最初ニ調印ノ都合ニ爲致度候間此度ハ平常公使ト御勘考無之實ニ老兄ノ實効ヲ奏スルハ今日ニ有之候又シーボルト氏モ隨分人ノ未ク同人迄不許處モ有之候間此度同氏モ非常ノ功ヲ奏シ此一事モ決濟スル時ハ實ニ老兄ト同氏ノ爲邦家ニスル大効ト可謂事業ニ候(中略)何卒森蛟島兩公使等異論ヲ不生様何モハ一モニヨースヲ以テ事ヲ成スヲ第一トシ銘々其功ヲ顯ハサンコトヲ深切ニ不成候様此際ハ森蛟島兩公使ヘモ御談話被下度候御自愛專一奉存候謹言

十三年六月十日