Folder 3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Inter-Governmental Committee to continue and develop the work of the Evian Meeting, London, 1938

(London Inter-Governmental Committee.)

FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.1,
3rd August, 1938.

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE AND DEVELOP THE WORK OF THE EVIAN MEETING, LONDON, 1938.

(*London Inter-Governmental Committee.*)

STENOGRAPHIC NOTES of the First Meeting of the Committee, held in the Locarno Room, Foreign Office, S.W.1, on Wednesday, 3rd August, 1938, at 11 a.m.

Lord Winterton (*United Kingdom*) : Gentlemen, as representative of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, I wish at the outset of our proceedings to welcome to England the representatives present here to-day of the countries which participated in the meeting at Evian. The Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, and the Home Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, have particularly asked to be associated with this welcome. It is a source of much satisfaction to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom that this Committee is to work in London, and I am glad to see round the table so many of us who worked together at Evian. We are particularly pleased to see Mr. Myron Taylor and Senator Bérenger, who, as Chairman and Honorary Chairman made such an outstanding contribution to the deliberations at Evian. I am indeed happy to know that they are continuing their association with this work, and that we in this Committee will have the benefit of their experience and advice. This Committee is charged with the duty of continuing and developing the work of the Evian Meeting, but before we proceed to the constitution of the Committee I wish to remind you that the Evian Meeting instructed its acting Chairman and its Honorary Chairman to continue to act on its behalf until this meeting in London, and in particular, to serve as a centre for the receipt of any communications which the Governments represented on the Committee might wish to send it. I therefore, suggest the proper course to adopt is to invite Mr. Taylor to take the Chair and ask him and Senator Bérenger to inform us of any developments which have taken place since the Evian Meeting terminated. Is that the wish of the Committee ?

(Agreed.)

Mr. Myron Taylor (*U.S.A.*) : Mr. Honorary Chairman, Lord Winterton and Gentlemen, before we invest our permanent Chairman with the important responsibility of carrying on the work on behalf of involuntary emigrants which was begun so auspiciously at Evian, I wish, as Acting Chairman, to interpret the sentiment of all my colleagues in expressing to the Government of the United Kingdom, and its distinguished Representatives here, our profound gratitude for the hospitable reception which has been accorded the Inter-governmental Committee at London. We are proud to have the British Government as our host, and we are deeply indebted to it for the pains which it has taken in organizing our second meeting.

As Acting Chairman, it is clear that my first duty is to report to the Committee on the progress of the work which was undertaken on the initiative of President Roosevelt and implemented at Evian, where we were received with such great courtesy by the Government of the French Republic. Briefly, our initial meeting which was in session from July 6th to July, 15th, 1938, accomplished three concrete things. It recommended to the thirty-two governments which co-operated in making it a success the setting up of machinery, complementary to existing machinery, for negotiation between the countries of origin of involuntary emigration, the countries of refuge and the countries of final settlement. It heard from private organizations and individuals plans and suggestions for ameliorating the condition of involuntary emigration. It received from the governments of countries of refuge

and final settlement some indication of the part each is prepared to contribute in effecting a solution of the problem which, succinctly stated, is that of substituting an orderly system of departure from countries whence there is involuntary emigration for the existing disorderly exodus of men, women and children who have no definite place to go. I am happy to report that the first step was taken in a spirit of closest possible co-operation between the governments concerned and with a deep consciousness of the serious nature of our task and of the urgent necessity for its prompt fulfilment. I am sure, moreover, that I express the views of all who attended the meeting at Evian when I say that there was ever present with us a realization that many thousands of our fellow human beings were looking to us for succour and assistance, that we had aroused the hopes of many thousands more and that we could not—we absolutely could not—fail.

We are met at London now to take a second and vital step. It is incumbent upon us to set in motion the machinery for negotiations which we have established, to evaluate the extent of our problem on the basis of information assembled at Evian, and to receive from the representatives of each of the governments participating here a more specific statement of what it is prepared to do in eliminating a major factor of unrest in international relations.

To-morrow, at the private session, I shall make a detailed statement of the technical position and shall attempt to evaluate it in concrete terms.

To-day, I shall, as Acting Chairman, attempt merely to define, or should I say redefine, in a general way the situation with which we are dealing in its relationship to current world affairs.

Fundamentally, this problem of involuntary emigration is one which challenges Western civilization. Briefly stated, Western civilization is the degree of progress of order under law in the struggle against anarchy and chaos. It is the saga of the march of humanity away from the rule of force to an orderly system of society where good neighbourliness is the rule, where there is real security for the individual and for the nation to which he belongs. Stated in other terms, it is the achievement of individuals in the national community and of nations in the world community in assuring to themselves and to one another a maximum of freedom and security under law in order, that they may make the fullest use of the powers latent in them for moral, intellectual and material attainment.

Civilization in the international sphere is predicated on a right and on a duty. The right is a sovereign right of each nation to promote the welfare of its citizens internally in the way of its choosing. The duty is the obligation imposed upon each nation, in promoting the welfare of its citizens, not to trespass upon the rights of other nations. The consequence is that in international affairs as in national affairs there must be orderly compromise under law.

It is this agreement in the solution of a problem which has become of international, of intergovernmental, concern that we are assembled here to seek, and, in seeking it, it is the purpose of our governments to proceed in the true spirit of Western civilization, each doing its share in order that all—the countries of origin of involuntary emigration, the countries of refuge and the countries of final settlement—may benefit.

Moreover, in charting our course in this complex problem, it may be helpful to realize that we are in a sense dealing with fundamental forces which have found expression in world affairs throughout the ages. The movement of peoples from the East to the West has been a twisted cord of many strands winding through the pages of history. Tribes and races in earlier days, landless agriculturists and contract labourers in more recent times have persistently moved westward in search of a livelihood.

Unfortunately, in the years subsequent to the Great War, just as forces have operated in some instances to restrain and in other instances to stimulate artificially the flow of goods, similar forces have acted in some instances to bar and in other instances to force artificially the flow of peoples. The consequence has been that thousands upon thousands of human beings have been uprooted from the homes where they have long been established and set adrift to wander without hope.

However, just as the time has come when statesmen in many countries, recognizing that peace and security in world affairs are dependent to a large extent upon happier economic conditions, are labouring to re-establish the orderly course

of world trade and commerce, similarly, the time has come when governments, recognizing that disorderly movements of peoples in great numbers makes for general unrest, must strive to re-establish the orderly course of migration.

The recognition of this necessity brings us here. As members of the family of civilized nations we face this our task. It is not easy, but we are confident that if all who have interest in ordering a solution of the problem of involuntary emigration will join their efforts with ours we shall succeed.

The difficulties with which we are confronted are not, in my opinion, insurmountable although the problem is fraught with many complexities. If, however, our desire for a straightforward solution is promptly met we shall find a method, and find it calmly and objectively, without prejudice and without passion.

It is a very agreeable duty to be able to call upon the Ambassador of France to the Conference, Senator Bérenger, without whose experience and whole-hearted co-operation our efforts at Evian would have been very much more difficult.

M. Henry Bérenger (*France*) (translation): Mr. Chairman and Presidents—In my capacity as Honorary Chairman of the Conference of Evian, it is for me an agreeable task first of all to thank His Excellency the Minister of His Britannic Majesty, for the friendly and flattering words with which he has been so good as to receive me on my arrival at the meeting to-day.

I am sure I interpret the views of all our colleagues who were at Evian, and also of all our new colleagues, in addressing to His Britannic Majesty's Minister, Lord Winterton, our thanks for the cordial and generous welcome he has given us to-day in the Locarno Room; in associating myself with the words of His Excellency Myron C. Taylor, our "active Chairman," I would ask him to be so good as to transmit to his colleagues of the British Government, especially to the Prime Minister and to Viscount Halifax, our thanks for the manner in which we have been welcomed here.

Therein we see the shape of a necessary collaboration between the Western nations for the work which we have to complete in Europe and the whole world.

These preliminary observations being made—and in remarking, further, that the assistance given to the persecuted Minorities is not the monopoly of any one nation, but that it is for the good of all and that it is in that spirit that we should work—I therefore ask you now for permission as the Representative of France and as the head of the French Delegation, to make some observations as briefly as possible.

The French Republic to-day by my voice unreservedly confirms to the British Government the support which it gave last month to the Evian Refugee Conference, in reply to the initiative taken by the President of the United States of America.

National sentiment is daily more moved to learn of the individual horrors resulting from the mass expatriations to which even more numerous classes of human beings are being subjected.

France has personally already done much since 1933 to receive, welcome, succour, reorganise and find positions for a large number of the human victims of the forced expatriations. From the beginning she has associated herself with every action conducted by the League of Nations at Geneva and elsewhere.

Those who are here as representatives of the League of Nations dealing with this work, Judge Hansson and the High Commissioner, Sir N. Malcolm, will bear witness to the effective and efficacious collaboration which my Government and my nation have brought from the beginning of this work, primarily to the sixth (political) commission of the League of Nations, and in the bodies which have since been created. Once again I thank them for the sympathetic words pronounced at Evian regarding my country, at the time of the first Conference.

France has given shelter on her territory to the greater part of the refugees who had the choice only between suicide in their old country or obtaining a refuge, even if only provisional, beyond the French frontier.

The French Government has done all that in permanent collaboration with the private societies, whose effective work in the actual circumstances can never be too much admired. France has thus remained faithful to the traditions of her development throughout history, which do not separate patriotism from humanity.

However, we see her now arrived practically at the point of saturation, which makes it impossible for her any longer to receive further refugees without destroying the equilibrium of her social organisation and of the new arrivals themselves. In every nation there is a limit to the possibilities of absorption. This limit has long since been passed in France. She said so at Evian ; she repeats it in London.

If I recall to you that among the forty million inhabitants in our European territory we have three and a half-million foreigners, and that at the present time we have more than two hundred thousand refugees, I am sure that I shall not need to insist upon this to so well-informed an audience.

The presence on French territory of several hundred thousands of refugees determines France all the more to support energetically the work of the Inter-governmental Committee meeting at London, after Evian, to organise methodically the exodus which has hitherto been so disorganised and even dangerous.

So long as human beings are torn from their homes and thrown beyond their frontiers after having been robbed of their property on no other charge than that of an arbitrary difference of race, based upon a so-called difference of quality of blood, disorder will only be accentuated in Europe and in the world. The nations which expel have towards the masses expelled more duties than the nations which receive them. So long as these duties are not recognised, defined, and put into practice by an understanding between the Governments which expel and the Governments which receive, the end of this disorder cannot really be expected.

The Government which expels should leave to the expelled their properties, which are up to the present their only means of livelihood. And the Governments who receive should accord to those they receive the means of working so that they may live in the new careers which may be open to them.

It is to reach this co-operation that our Committee should address itself, with a view to an immediate result, for there are human disasters which should not be allowed to aggravate themselves.

We must act quickly, for the suicides are increasing, ruin is accumulating, the brusque displacement of these human masses menaces not only Europe but also other continents and the whole of the human race.

Nothing can be more contrary to international order than the systematic continuation of a regime of persecution and violence against the Minorities inside national groups.

The hunting of a man, the appropriation of his property, the concentration camp, beyond which there is as horizon only the graveyard, all that which is contrary to human dignity can only result in a catastrophic disturbance of the relations between nations.

The efforts of diplomatists—and that is our position here, seeing that we represent the Governments—should therefore be to search for a system of co-operation between the nations of the world, which would permit without delay the organisation of an ordered emigration instead of disorganised proscriptions. The information which we receive daily from Central Europe proves the necessity of reaching a rapid and practical conclusion to the resolutions adopted on the 15th July last by the Inter-governmental Conference at Evian.

For these reasons the representative of France supports very willingly the reasons which the Delegate of the United States of America has put forward, with the exceptional authority of his Government in this matter.

I therefore propose to you, Gentlemen, to constitute without delay the definite Bureau of our Committee, and to elect firstly, as our permanent President, the statesman who receives us to-day in the name of his great country as the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, His Excellency Lord Winterton, His Britannic Majesty's Minister. At Evian we all appreciated the firmness of his character, the distinction of his thought, the charm of his personality. We shall therefore, I think, be unanimous in saying that the presence of Lord Winterton at the head of our permanent Bureau will appear as the best form of collaboration in the work proposed to our Governments by His Excellency Mr. Myron C. Taylor, in the name of the President, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, a work of which all the Governments represented at Evian have already shown their appreciation, and which he will know how to continue with the same great qualities which enabled him to initiate it.

Dr. Don Manuel E. Malbrau (Argentine) : I second the proposal of the French Representative to elect Lord Winterton as President of the Committee.

Mr. Taylor (United States of America) : Does anyone else wish to be heard ? I am sure that would be the unanimous judgment of this distinguished body. I should like, therefore, to have the approval of the nomination in the usual manner. Will those in favour of the proposition please signify by raising their hand ? The verdict is overwhelmingly unanimous, and I think we are very greatly to be congratulated upon having Lord Winterton as our permanent Chairman.

(At this stage in the proceedings Lord Winterton took the Chair.)

Lord Winterton (United Kingdom) ; Gentlemen, I must thank you, M. Bérenger, for your most kind reference to me. It is very pleasant to have such a tribute from a colleague and friend. I must thank the meeting also for its support of M. Bérenger's proposal that I should be Chairman. It will be an honour for me to be your Chairman, and I shall use my best endeavours always to further the beneficent task to which we round this table have set our hands.

The next task before the Committee is the election of four Vice-Chairmen, in conformity with the resolution passed at our meeting at Evian on the 15th July. I venture to propose that the following Governments should appoint a Vice-Chairman : the United States of America, Brazil, France, and the Netherlands.

Judge Michael Hansson (Norway) (translated) : I am glad to second the proposition that the four countries named should appoint a Vice-President, and I am glad to see the inclusion of the Netherlands, which have such great experience in the matter.

Lord Winterton (United Kingdom) : Gentlemen, I take it it is your wish that that proposal, which has been put forward by me and seconded by Judge Hansson should be adopted ? If so, would you signify in the usual way by holding up your hands ?

(Agreed.)

The next business is most important, that of the appointment of the Director. I have the pleasure to invite the representative of the United States of America, my friend, Mr. Myron Taylor, to address the Committee.

Mr. Taylor (United States of America) : Mr. Chairman, in our discussions at Evian, and having in mind the manner in which this activity originated, at the instance of the President of the United States, it was suggested to me that I communicate with our Government, the United States, and with the President, and ask if he had in mind a man of experience who might well become the Director, and I have received a reply, and I am placing before you, for your consideration, the name of Mr. George Rublee.

Mr. George Rublee is one of the outstanding lawyers in the United States, with wide experience in international law. He was born in 1868, and was graduated from Harvard in 1890 and from the Harvard Law School in 1895. He has had a rather distinguished public career, having served as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, by appointment of President Wilson, in 1915-16 as a member of the Commercial Economy Board, appointed by the Council of National Defence in 1917 ; and as Special Counsel to the United States Treasury, in 1917 ; as delegate to the Allied Maritime Transport Council in London in 1918-19, and as adviser to the American Delegation to the London Naval Conference in 1930. In addition, he served for some years as legal adviser to the American Embassy in Mexico City, and played an active role in the negotiations with the Mexican Government during the years 1925 to 1930. Since 1921 he has been a partner in the law firm of Covington, Burling & Rublee, of Washington. Amongst his other private activities he is an overseer of Harvard University. Mr. Chairman, I propose the name of Mr. George Rublee.

M. Henry Bérenger (France) (translated) : I second the proposition that Mr. George Rublee should be named as permanent Director.

Lord Winterton (United Kingdom): Gentlemen, I should like, both as your Chairman and also speaking on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, to say how much we should welcome the appointment of Mr. George Rublee as Permanent Director. The proposition that Mr. George Rublee be the Permanent Director has been duly proposed and seconded. Is it your pleasure that the appointment should be made? If so, would you hold up your hands in the usual way?

(Agreed.)

I would suggest that a full account of our proceedings this morning should be communicated to the Press. I will not make any formal resolution on that subject. I take it that that is the wish of all present?

(Agreed.)

Gentlemen, this concludes the morning's business. The next meeting of the Committee will be held to-morrow at 11 a.m. when I think we should discuss some of the details of the problem. It is hoped that it will not be necessary to ask the Committee to sit after to-morrow. The meeting of the Committee to-morrow will be an executive session.

(The Committee adjourned at 12.15 p.m.)

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE AND DEVELOP THE WORK OF THE EVIAN MEETING, LONDON, 1938

London Inter-Governmental Committee.

STENOGRAPHIC NOTES of the Second Meeting of the Committee, held in the Locarno Room, Foreign Office, S.W.1., on Thursday, 4th August, 1938, at 11 a.m.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): Gentlemen, I have pleasure in calling upon Mr. Myron Taylor, the United States Delegate, to address the Committee.

Mr. Myron Taylor (United States of America): The Inter-governmental Committee, at its initial meeting at Evian, had a threefold objective.

First, it had to set up machinery, complementary to existing machinery, for negotiation between the country, or countries, of origin of involuntary emigrants, the countries of refuge and the countries of final settlement.

Second, it had to evaluate the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria, as to its extent and nature.

Third, it had to assemble data with regard to existing resources for absorbing the involuntary emigration.

The initial meeting was successful in establishing the machinery of negotiation, as our presence here and the election of a Chairman, four Vice-Chairmen and a Director yesterday attest. It was successful in eliciting information which enables us to determine the nature and size of the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany and Austria. It was successful in that it enabled the governments of refuge and settlement to give information as to the resources of which they dispose for absorbing involuntary emigrants and the contribution which each is prepared to make towards a positive solution of the harrowing problem with which we are concerned.

I am firmly convinced, in consequence, that we have reached the point now where we can enter successfully upon the substance of the problem, starting with the premises that a solution is possible and practicable and that this solution must be found in concert with all those who have an interest in the elimination of a disturbing factor in contemporary international life. In other words, there must be an interchange between the country or countries whence come the involuntary emigrants, the countries where they find temporary refuge, and the countries of final settlement. We must be frank to admit that without this interchange it will be difficult, if not impossible, to transform a disorderly exodus into an orderly emigration.

Predicating our approach to the problem on these premises, it is incumbent upon us to define the problem in terms of figures, based upon information which we have obtained from various reliable sources. In estimating the extent of the problem, it is essential for us to realise that the persons with whom we are concerned include those of the Jewish, Roman Catholic and the Protestant faiths, persons with no Church connections, persons of every profession and occupation, including industrial and agricultural workers. We should also consider, in our attempt to bring the problem within practicable limits, that older persons are, for the most part, not suited to the conditions of settlement in other countries and will evidently be provided for by remittances from those who have emigrated. They can, therefore, be eliminated from immediate consideration. With these factors in mind and by applying reliable age distribution percentages to census figures of Jews, and estimates of non-Aryans, according to the Nuremberg Laws, we come to the conclusion that there is a total of approximately 660,900 persons at present in

Germany including Austria for whom opportunities for resettlement must be found. This total includes approximately 198,100 Jews in the old Reich, subdivided into age groups of 16 per cent of the total Jewish population between 0 and 20 years, or 54,300; 30 per cent between 20 and 45 years, or 106,700; 11 per cent between 45 and 50 years, or 37,100. Then there are approximately 102,300 Jews in the former Austria, subdivided in age groups of 21 per cent between 0 and 20 years, or 36,650; 41 per cent between 20 and 45 years, or 67,650. The Non-Aryan totals are more difficult to establish, but, after careful analysis of the figures, we have come to the conclusion that there are approximately 75,000 Roman Catholics, and a total is reached, as I stated above, of about 660,900.

Let us now turn to the occupational distribution of these potential emigrants. An examination of the occupational distribution of about 15,000 recent Jewish applicants for emigration from Germany indicates that 29 per cent were business men and office employees; 18 per cent were craftsmen; 6 per cent were of the liberal professions; 4 per cent were labourers; 4 per cent were domestic workers. It must be observed in this connection, however, that the intensification of agricultural training for young people in Germany in recent years suggests that the percentage of agricultural workers may from this time on be materially increased. I might add that an occupational classification of non-Jews, including non-Aryans, in former Austria gives about 32 per cent engaged in agriculture.

The figures above together with the indications as to occupational distribution give us a clear picture of the extent and nature of the problem with which we are bound to deal.

Our next task is to determine the rate at which the potential emigrants leave in order that they may be absorbed temporarily, in many cases, by the countries of refuge, and finally by the countries of settlement. Turning to the past, statistics show that the emigration of Jews from Germany before the absorption of Austria was at the rate of 22,000 annually in 1936 and 1937. If, for purposes of reaching a reliable estimate, we assume that Jewish emigration in those years bore a relationship to emigration of non-Aryans of two to one, we must conclude that total emigration from Germany was at the rate of approximately 30,000 to 33,000 persons in 1936 and 1937. Since the pressure has increased following upon the absorption of Austria, it may be assumed that emigration from Germany including Austria in 1938 may have reached a total of 40,000 persons. At this rate of emigration, the task of re-establishing 660,900 emigrants from Germany including Austria would require 16 years in time.

Evidently the plight of those who are the concern of the Inter-governmental Committee requires that the present process of emigration be accelerated. It should be accelerated to a point where the resettlement may be realized possibly within the next five years. Accordingly, we must determine without further delay the total number of those who are obliged to leave Germany including Austria who can be absorbed annually elsewhere in the world.

To begin with, I believe that it is imperative that involuntary emigrants should be permitted to leave their country of origin with their property, in order that they may have means to meet the cost of transportation and of settlement at their final destination. This problem is one for the particular consideration of the Director, who is instructed by the Resolution adopted at Evian "to undertake negotiations to improve present conditions of exodus and to replace them by conditions of orderly emigration." It may, therefore, be premature at this time to do more than touch upon this question of funds required by involuntary emigrants.

In the second place, it must be conceded that the countries of refuge may continue to have to provide for a time some temporary asylum to involuntary emigrants on their way to final settlement. The countries of refuge have been most generous in this respect in the past and it is encouraging that their spokesmen at Evian gave assurances that they would continue to make a contribution, especially in the matter of training involuntary emigrants for settlement in countries of final destination.

The last word clearly must come from the countries of settlement. For its part the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1938, accepted approximately 17,000 involuntary emigrants from Germany for permanent residence. Moreover, my Government has expressed its willingness to admit in the current fiscal year emigrants from Germany, qualifying under its immigration laws and practices, to the full extent of the quota limitations, or 27,370. Other Governments

whose national legislations do not admit immigrants under quota provisions were unable to state in advance the number which they might eventually admit. Many, however, gave indications as to the type of immigrants which they would receive and most offered to study the question sympathetically and to pursue specific inquiries to the end that they might share in the positive solution of the problem.

I am hopeful that in the interim following the meeting at Evian the representatives of the countries of settlement have had an opportunity to consult their governments further and will be prepared at this second meeting to offer in confidence supplementary statements indicating specifically the part of the involuntary emigration which each is disposed to take.

To recapitulate, the line of our endeavour originates in the country or countries whence there is involuntary emigration, passes through the countries of refuge and ends in the countries of settlement. We must begin with orderly emigration from the country of origin over an allotted period. This requires negotiation with the Government of the country of origin which will be the immediate task of our Director. Then there must be a contribution by the countries of refuge, for example in the form of re-training of involuntary emigrants. Finally, there must be an equitable distribution of the involuntary emigrants in the countries of settlement. Each is a vital link in a chain which cannot be broken if we are to succeed.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): Gentlemen, the matter is now open for discussion.

Mr. Myron Taylor (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Director will sail on the 10th August and will probably arrive in London on the 15th or 16th of the month.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): As no other Representative appears to wish to join in the discussion now, I think it will be agreed that all the Committee can do for the moment is to take note of Mr. Taylor's most important and interesting statement.

As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, I do not think that I can usefully add to the statements made by me and my colleague, Sir Michael Palairet, at Evian, and the speeches which were made by Lord Plymouth in the House of Lords and by myself in the House of Commons in recent Debates which we have had in our Parliament on the subject, as regards the part which H.M. Government in the United Kingdom are able to play in this problem. H.M. Government, I might however say, have the matters which have been so very clearly and succinctly dealt with by Mr. Taylor in his speech constantly under consideration. But perhaps before I sit down I might make this further statement. I wish earnestly to ask all members of the Committee to supplement as soon as possible and to the best of their ability the information which they handed in at Evian regarding the contribution which they are in a position to make to the problem before us in the directions indicated by Mr. Taylor. These statements should be communicated to the Chairman, and they will be circulated by him for the confidential information of the Committee and the Director.

Gentlemen, the next item on the Agenda consists of two questions which were left to this meeting of the Committee by the Resolution of the Evian Meeting.

The first of those matters is the allocation of expenses. The Evian Meeting recommended that this Committee should consider the scale on which its expenses should be apportioned among the participating Governments. I would suggest for the consideration of the Committee that it would be appropriate to adopt the scale upon which the expenses of the Evian Meeting were divided, and which was itself based on the scale in use at Geneva in respect of contributions to the League of Nations and to the International Labour Office respectively.

I may say that the expenses of the Committee's meetings will be extremely small, and I understand that it is the intention to keep the expenses of the Director and his small personal staff at the lowest possible figure.

Mr. Myron Taylor (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, if there is to be discussion I should perhaps say beforehand that in response to enquiry I have found that the compensation of the Director, which formed the basis for his engagement,

was stated by my Government to be something between 10,000 and 15,000 dollars, and of the Assistant Director 7,500 dollars per annum. I think you would best have those figures in mind at this point.

M. Henry Bérenger (France). (Translation) : I would like to make a few observations.

We are entering a rather delicate part of our work, that which concerns the financial, and therefore budgetary contributions. As far as republican or democratic countries are concerned, with which we shall have to deal in this Inter-governmental Committee, we have hitherto been bound by the Evian resolution.

If reference is made to Annex IV, page 54 of the text, we see that paragraph (*d*)reads :

> " That the Governments of the countries of refuge and settlement should not assume any obligations for the financing of involuntary emigration."

This is a decision taken by the Evian Committee, and by which we are consequently bound. This wording may be interpreted in different ways. Does it refer to the financing of the transport of persons who are called involuntary emigrants (who are simply people expelled from their country), or does it refer to the financing of administrative and office expenses which might be involved over and above this exodus of refugees ? This point is somewhat obscure, and will have to be cleared up.

On the other hand, we are also bound by paragraph (*f*) of this same Annex IV. On page 55 you will see the following :—

> " The Inter-governmental Committee, recognising the value of the work of the existing refugee services of the League of Nations and of the studies of migration made by the International Labour Office, shall co-operate fully with these organisations, and the Inter-governmental Committee at London shall consider the means by which the co-operation of the Committee and the Director with these organisations shall be established. The Inter-governmental Committee, at its forthcoming meeting at London, will consider the scale on which its expenses shall be apportioned among the participating Governments."

We have thus entered into a sort of undertaking, at any rate a moral one, to examine this question at this meeting in a certain form. That is precisely the purpose of the discussion which is now opened.

Finally, in Annex V we have the " Proposals by the Bureau regarding the expenses of the Inter-governmental Committee and their Allocation," which are similar to the plan for the allocation of expenses which was communicated to us just now. But this Annex V only takes into account the expenses of Evian, and does not refer to later expenses. It merely refers to the sharing of the small expenses made at Evian by the thirty-two governments represented there, for which, incidentally, the French Government made the provisional advance.

The question which is now raised becomes somewhat delicate. I have already had occasion, at Lausanne, in 1934, and later in Geneva, in different committees, in my capacity as French delegate, to present certain observations on behalf of my Government. We are dealing with a philanthropic work, which has been admirably described by the Honourable Myron C. Taylor on various occasions. It is also an important political task which is superimposed on the philanthropic work. I think, therefore, that the first observation I have to make, which I already made in 1934, 1935, and in 1937, is that the expenses which are to be fixed must be extremely small, in view of the fact that the unfortunate people whom for the present we must save and whom later we must re-establish, have no money. They are thrown out by the countries carrying out these expulsions, and they have been deprived of their fortune, and sometimes even of their clothes and furniture ; they have nothing. They arrive completely stripped of everything, and the neighbouring countries are compelled to take them in. We know a good deal about it. So does Holland. The countries bordering on Germany—we can mention her name, since we are sitting *in camera*, know what expenses this involves.

We are not only dealing with Germany. Spaniards are now arriving. To-morrow there will perhaps be others. We do not know.

These are extremely difficult problems. Any bureaucracy added to what the League of Nations has done (and it has been well done ; I must render them this tribute ; they have made a magnificent effort) would, if the expenses are high, give rise to what we are accustomed to term in our assemblies " certain reactions."

I am taking the liberty of making that observation. I am compelled to make it on behalf of my Government, because I have neither the power nor the instructions to extend the expenses incurred at Evian, which were quite small, and for which my Government made the necessary advance, as I have mentioned already. I have no instructions to enlarge these to any considerable extent.

Now what we have at present is rather vague. I say it among ourselves ; it is not for public consumption, or for the press, since we are carrying out our discussions *in camera*. I consider it rather vague, because, to put it quite bluntly, we have no budget forecast. You may tell me that a budget forecast is at the same time a draft authorisation of expenditure and a provisional forecast of receipts. You are well aware that we will not find many forecasts of receipts other than the contributions from the taxpayers whom we represent here, in the different countries. There remain the expenses. Now the economic and financial situation of the countries represented here is not good. Every country is trying to economise to the utmost of its powers, for it is on the balancing of their budgets that their life depends.

I would like to conclude these unduly lengthy remarks by a simple question : What is the forecast of expenses which is being submitted to us ? At present we have the nomination of a Director and of an Assistant Director. These are two expenses, but would they be the limit ? Is there a plan ? If so, what is it ? On behalf of my Government I am compelled to put up a barrier and to say : for the present I am compelled to wait, because I have not been shown a plan. We are accustomed to vote expenses on the basis of a forecast, and I believe this is the custom in every country. We would like to know where we are going if you persevere in this direction.

M. Gustav Rasmussen (Denmark). (Translation) : I would like to ask whether it would not be possible to divide this question into two parts : (1) to lay down a precise definition regarding the nature of the expenses to be covered, i.e., if I am not mistaken, salaries and office expenses ; and (2) to fix the maximum amount—this for reasons of a parliamentary nature. Some Governments would find it difficult to secure a vote for unspecified expenses.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor (U.S.A.) : May I observe that the attitude of my Government is that the cost of the activity which shall be carried on by the Director should be the very minimum possible. There is no desire to expand his office into a large bureau. We should disapprove of that. The objective that we have sought to attain has been to get a suitable man with suitable experience in international matters who would be best fitted to contact with the Governments from which the emigrants will flow, and I am confident that, knowing so well the sympathetic heart of the Director who has been elected in humanitarian activity, that he would be the last one to consider the monetary question involved. On the other hand, there is a practical question in his instance because he has given so much of his time in the past without compensation to inter-governmental activities of one sort and another that I very reluctantly speak of the matter of compensation on his behalf at all, but I think that that is quite essential ; and on behalf of his assistant, I am sure, knowing his quality and capacity, that the amount that would be involved in that instance would be very very well expended in the interests of the results that we are seeking. It is very difficult for anyone to estimate in advance the cost of an activity of this character, but I quite sympathise with Senator Bérenger and with the delegate who has spoken in their desire to have some rather definite limit put upon it. I have been a bit puzzled by this question myself and have asked myself whether we would accomplish the result that we desire if we allowed it to remain open until after the Director arrived when we might have another meeting of this Inter-governmental Committee, but that only postpones matters. If there was an amount, an appropriate amount as the limit, the actual expenditure, of course, being subject to the approval of the Chairman, it seems that that might meet the situation. I think the particular participation by the countries represented would in any case not be large. The suggestion of fixing an

amount with a limit, but subject in its expenditure to the wisdom and discretion of the Chairman would seem to me to be a safe way to leave the question if we could arrive at an amount.

M. Henry Bérenger (France). (Translation): The question which arises is this: the Director and the Assistant Director will not be able to work by themselves, for there are a number of things where help will be required. Presumably they have in mind a staff and, if possible, we would like to know what that staff will be.

M. Gustav Rasmussen (Denmark): May I add one word. I did not intend to criticise the amounts mentioned by Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor (United States of America): I realise that.

M. Henry Bérenger (France). (Translation): Neither did I. I quite agree.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor (United States of America): If I may say our thoughts, so far as they have crystallised at all, have been that in addition to the Director and his assistant, there would only be necessary one or two stenographers, not any other highly paid individuals, whatever stenographic help was necessary. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this. It has not been our conception, and I am sure it has not been the conception of any member of the Committee, that we were setting up an agency which would handle in any sense the detail of emigration. My conception is that we are engaged in defining principles and matters of great policy and not undertaking to administer activities. Is not that correct? Principles, and to negotiate with the Governments creating the situation, but not to undertake to indulge in detailed activities of the emigration itself.

M. Henry Bérenger (France.) (Translation): I entirely agree with the general lines envisaged, it seems, by our eminent Chairman the Honourable Myron C. Taylor. A great deal of work of this nature has been done. Those of us who have followed the work of the League of Nations and the work of the organisations which exist around the League of Nations know that a great many statistics have been worked out. Statistics are legion. I do not believe that it would serve any useful purpose to begin this work again, in view of the fact that there are thousands, and even hundreds of thousands or millions of unfortunate people who expect something more than statistics.

Thus I entirely agree with the Chairman and with Mr. Myron Taylor, and I am happy that we are adopting the course of getting into touch with the German Government. Let us call it by its name, since hitherto it is the only Government with which we are concerned. This does not necessitate a mass of special investigations. The question is the following. We do not suppose that the Director and Assistant Director will themselves take in hand pencil or pen and write their own correspondence. They therefore need a minimum number of stenographers and typists. At present the expenses are as follows: 15,000 dollars on the one hand and 7,000 dollars on the other, i.e., a total of 22,000 dollars. This sum represents in the currency of my country 714,000, say 720,000 francs approximately. I hope you will forgive me for saying this in the course of this little debate. I know only too well what I can expect, as former Rapporteur of my country's budget, when I go back to France. For my part I am under the impression that, if we fix expenses at 30,000 dollars, there would remain 6,000 dollars for the shorthand and other work which might be required by the Director and Assistant Director. We should, therefore, have a basis. I take the liberty of suggesting or proposing this sum, but am open to contradiction. We could say to our Governments that we will participate on a proportional basis in a figure amounting to 30,000 dollars; since there are 22,000 dollars for the Director and Assistant Director, there would remain 6,000 dollars for the Staff, which need not be very large.

I apologise for expressing these views, but cannot do otherwise. We are not autocrats; we are subject to parliamentary habits and to the parliamentary commissions which control our accounts. We are constantly criticised on account of the League of Nations and of the very great expenses incurred. A moment

arrives when we are compelled to consider figures, in view of the tremendous expenses which have been incurred on behalf of refugees, and of the sums spent every day by France, not only for the Germans, but also for the Spaniards.

I think that if we accepted the figure of $30,000 at present for the expenses which might be incurred, these gentlemen could manage their affairs so as to conform with our vote.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): I think it would be for the convenience of the meeting if I attempted something in the way of summing up of the arguments that have been adduced by Mr. Taylor, Senator Bérenger and the representative of Denmark. I do not think that there need be any, or indeed, is any difference of opinion as to the meaning of the resolutions by which, as M. Bérenger very truly pointed out, we are bound at this meeting, our Government having accepted those recommendations. The first of the recommendations which M. Bérenger cited is recommendation (*d*) on page 54:—

> "That the Governments of the countries of refuge and settlement should not assume any obligations for the financing of involuntary emigration."

That has been accepted by all the Governments and is inherent in the situation. The second recommendation to which I wish to call attention, recommendation (*f*), deals with the duties of the Director to be appointed at this meeting and I think it was implicit in the recommendation that that Director and the staff which he would require to perform his duties, should receive a salary. That, at any rate, was the impression left on my mind and that of the United Kingdom Delegation. I do not think there should be any difference of opinion there. The suggested duties of this Director are defined in this recommendation (*f*). The next question as it seems to me in order is the question of the allocation among the countries represented at this meeting of the scale of the expenses and I should hope that you would be willing to adopt the same allocation as that which we adopted at Evian; in other words, the Evian scale. The last and most important point is the question of what the total amount of these expenses should be, that is to say, the cost of the salary of the Director, of his Assistant, of a small clerical staff and of his office together with the expenses in which he would be involved in journeys which he may be required to make. So far as I know there will be no other expenses of any sort. Now it is not for me to judge as Chairman between the arguments which have been used, but I venture to hope that there is not any very great difference of opinion between those who have addressed the meeting. I have a suggestion to make; I want to make it clear it is only a suggestion, and that is this, that we should agree to a maximum sum in respect of this cost which I have just defined of $50,000, and that it should be left by a resolution of this meeting to the four Vice-Chairmen and myself to deal with the matter, or, to put it in other words, to arrange the cost within the limit of a maximum of $50,000, I may say as a member of the British Government, I am as fully alive as anyone could be round this table to the need for economy, not only by my Government but by the other Governments represented round this table too, saving them as much as possible in the matter of financial cost. I would venture to suggest to my friend, M. Bérenger, that possibly he might be willing to accept this figure of a limit of $50,000 in the confident expectation that if the meeting accepted the proposal the four Vice-Chairmen and myself would endeavour to arrange the matter on the most economical basis possible, having due regard to the need for paying a proper salary to this distinguished Director and his Assistant and in providing him with the necessary expenses.

M. Henry Bérenger (France). (Translation): On behalf of my Government I made some observations which I fully realise were somewhat arid, and perhaps a little severe. It was my duty to do so. I need not repeat what the delegate from Denmark has already said. Along with this duty was implied a tribute for all those who have been chosen, incidentally by myself as well as by the others, to form the head of this Bureau. This tribute has been addressed to them, but you know full well that in questions of finance we must never allow questions of personalities to interfere.

We therefore remain on practical ground: the ground of the budgetary expenses, or, to put it more accurately, financial expenses which we must incur. It is not a budget; it is a forecast of expenses.

Our honourable Chairman, Lord Winterton, thinks that the maximum figure which I proposed was a little restricted. I entirely agree with him, but belonging to a poor nation, which is weighed down with burdens of all kinds, I am compelled to suggest something modest.

But if something a little larger can be allowed, I will not oppose it. None the less, I am compelled to say that I must refer the question to my Government. I do not indeed believe that they will contradict me, but I am compelled to make this reserve. It is a constitutional one. I am not entitled to bind France to incur expenses any more than the Government, incidentally, outside parliamentary usage. But subject to this reserve, which is one of form rather than of substance, I think that if the figure proposed by the Chairman is a maximum, a limit which will not be exceeded, we can make this gesture.

But we must then ask our Chairman, as well as the Director who will be nominated—who is already nominated and will soon arrive—that they do not consider this budget of 50,000 dollars compulsory expenses as happens in our national budgets. I have experienced this of old in French budgets: if we were asked for 100 millions to carry out more or less urgent work, we could perhaps succeed in not spending the 100 millions a year provided in the budget, but it often happens that the head or director of the department may say: We have 100 millions; we must spend them cost what it may! And they then create Assistant Directors and all sorts of things, and in the end, as you know as well as I do, great difficulties are created in each nation's budget. I would not like to see this habit extended to inter-governmental matters, and I would like to ask our eminent Chairman, of whose wisdom and spirit of economy we are all well aware (he has amply proved it as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster) to consider this figure of 50,000 dollars as a maximum which need not necessarily be spent. If only 40,000 dollars were spent, it would be so much gained for the different countries and for the refugees. Perhaps the total of 50,000 dollars would not be reached. With this reserve, and on condition that the Bureau will be asked to examine this suggestion, I accept the proposal.

Dr. Don Manuel E. Malbran (Argentine Republic). (Translation): I entirely agree with the remarks just made by Senator Bérenger. Usually when a certain sum is voted one is inclined to spend it.

As we are all here under similar circumstances, I would like to ask a question, which is merely meant to be a request: Would it not be possible for the Committee to authorise a sum of 30,000 dollars, and at the same time authorise a committee composed of the Chairman and the four Vice-Chairmen which, in case of need, might increase that sum from 30,000 to 50,000 dollars. This is not a proposal. I merely ask whether this would be possible.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): Perhaps my friend the Argentine Ambassador would allow me to make a reply to the point he has put forward and which I think can best be met by suggesting a form of a recommendation which I hope the Committee might be willing to accept. When I have read out this suggested recommendation I think it might meet the point raised by the Argentine Ambassador. I suggest we might pass the following resolution: that this be a resolution to the participating Governments represented at the meeting:

> "That the cost of the salary of the Director, his Assistant, clerical staff, office and travelling expenses should not exceed 50,000 United States dollars per annum and that the Chairman and the Vice-Chairmen should, after consultation, be authorised to approve the provision of a sum within, and if possible, below that limit allocated among the participating nations on the Evian scale."

Perhaps I might add that that would be a clear indication to us to try and keep the expenses, if possible, lower than that sum.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor (U.S.A.): I am very happy to make that a motion.

Judge Michael Hansson (Norway). (Translation): I would like to say the same thing. It is a happy formula.

Senor Don Humberto Videla (Chile): I have no power to accept this without referring it to my Government.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): That is in the resolution that this is a recommendation. It applies to all of us, it is a recommendation of the meeting to our Governments. I hope you will agree to make the recommendation. I take it that is the wish of the meeting?

(Agreed.)

May I then express the hope as Chairman that all my colleagues round this table will do their best to persuade their Governments to agree to this recommendation.

There is one small matter I must now mention, that is the expenses of these meetings. It is calculated the expenses will be only a few pounds and I should hope it would not be necessary to have many meetings. Is it your wish that the expense should be allocated in the same way on the Evian scale. As the cost of these two meetings will only be some £20, the amount between the Governments will not be very large. Is that agreed?

(Agreed.)

M. Beucher Andreae (Netherlands): May I ask one question. At what moment and in what way will the final fixation of the budget be communicated? Will there be such a moment? The reason we cannot fix an amount now is because we do not yet know exactly what it will be, but there will come a time when it will be possible to do so and then should there not be something arranged as to the way in which it will be communicated?

Lord Winterton (Chairman): I am glad my colleague has raised this point. It is an important matter of detail. The decision which will be taken by the Vice-Chairmen and myself after, of course, talking to the Director, will be communicated to the participating Governments round this table and I should hope it would be possible to make that decision within a comparatively short time.

The next item on the Agenda, to which I have already referred, arises out of the Resolution of the Evian Meeting, which recommended that this Committee should consider the means by which full co-operation should be established between the Committee and its Director on the one hand, and the Refugee Organisations of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office on the other. Well, I do not think this is a matter which need give rise to any difficulty, or which requires any formal resolution of any sort. The High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany and our Director have certain functions which are the special province of each. For example, the High Commissioner is concerned with the legal protection and status of refugees, and the Director with potential refugees still in Germany, and the negotiations with the country of origin. There is, however, a certain field of activity which is to some extent common to both individuals, notably in respect of the admission of refugees into countries of refuge and settlement, and the co-ordination of the work of the private organisations, which is incidentally a very important part and will be a very important part of their duties. I feel certain that the Director and the High Commissioner, who will both have their head-quarters in London, will rapidly establish relations of mutual confidence, and it would be superfluous for this Committee to attempt to lay down any procedure of consultation; indeed, the principle of full co-operation has already been established at the Evian Meeting. I would suggest, therefore, that all we are called upon to do is to ensure that the High Commissioner and the Director are represented when matters common to both the Director and the High Commissioner are under discussion by this Committee. The same considerations also apply to the work of the International Labour Office. Again, the work of the Director may have some relation to the work which the International Labour Office is doing on the question of migration, and we ought, I would submit to the Committee, to ensure that the International Office is represented when questions concerning migration are before this Committee. In conclusion, therefore, I would suggest, for the consideration of my colleagues, that in order to ensure the co-ordination of the work of this Committee, and its Director, with the Refugee services of the

League of Nations, the High Commmissioner for Refugees coming from Germany should be invited to be represented at the meetings of the Inter-governmental Committee at which questions concerning the admission of involuntary emigrants into countries of refuge and settlement and questions concerning the work of the private organisations are under discussion. Similarly, that the Director of the International Labour Office shall be invited to meetings of this Committee at which questions affecting migration are under discussion.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with your thought that no resolution is necessary upon any part of this question at this time, and I am moved to make that observation for two reasons, the first of which is that we yesterday elected a Director, who is not yet present, and who, in his duties, should be associated with any obligation that might be put upon him by the Inter-governmental Committee; and for the second reason, that the League of Nations has indicated that it is, at the meeting, I think, of the 10th September, about to legislate with respect to this question, so that at the moment there is a hiatus which makes it rather difficult to appraise intelligently just what we should be undertaking to do if we resolved ourselves into some form of resolution at this time. The relationship which has existed between the League activity and the Inter-governmental Committee has been a most friendly and agreeable one, and our meetings of the Inter-governmental Committee between now and the action of the League may be, probably will be, very few, perhaps none at all, at which, of course, as a matter of courtesy, the Chairman would have the privilege of inviting the representative of the League Authorities to be present, just as he did at our meeting of yesterday, so that I would like very much to suggest that except for these expressions we take no formal action in this matter at this time.

Judge Michael Hansson (Norway). (Translation): At Evian we decided that at the London meeting the Committee would examine the means whereby the relationship would be established between the Committee and the Director on the one hand and the different organisations of the League of Nations on the other. It seems to me that the Acting Chairmen have carried out this work, with the result that Lord Winterton has just described to us.

According to the formula which the Chairman was kind enough to communicate to me yesterday, the Committee should decide that in order to ensure co-operation with the League of Nations, " the High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany should be invited to be represented at the meetings of the Inter-governmental Committee at which questions concerning the admission of involuntary emigrants into countries of refuge and settlement and questions concerning the work of the private organisations are under discussion. Similarly the Director of the International Labour Office should be invited to be represented at the meetings of the Committee at which questions affecting emigration are under discussion." This formula is a happy one. It is a little vague, but it indicates sufficiently our intention, i.e., the clear distinction between the organisations of the League of Nations and everything pertaining to them and the very special task of the Inter-governmental Committee, which is to prepare for emigration on a large scale. This Conference should define the distinction so that there may be no confusion.

I am sorry to note that there is already a certain confusion in the press, and people are beginning to speak of this Inter-governmental Committee and its work as though as if there were a question of naturalising the new emigrants, of absorbing them and of assimilating them. All these questions already concern the Organisations and Secretariat of the League of Nations. In 1930 a unanimous resolution was taken, which provided that the legal and political protection of the Nansen refugees was the province of the secretariat. It is the humanitarian side of the work which was entrusted to the Nansen Office. In point of fact it is the Nansen Office and not the League of Nations which with the express or tacit consent of the secretariat has done nearly everything; but if the impossible should happen, and it were decided at the next Assembly not to continue the work on behalf of the refugees in general, their protection would devolve entirely on the secretariat. I trust that we shall never reach this point, but a certain tendency none the less exists to free the League of Nations from this complex task. It costs a certain amount, even though it is not very much.

In the circumstances I was happy to learn of this formula, which lays down that the co-operation between the League of Nations and the new organisation can only concern the special sphere of emigration. I take this opportunity to say that I have already observed a certain anxiety among the refugees of the Nansen Office. So far, it has always been supported by the League of Nations in its humanitarian work, which is however, in fact, a mixture of political, legal and purely humanitarian questions.

This question (up to what point must the Secretariat of the League of Nations support and help this former emigration ?) has been the subject of several discussions, but it has been observed more and more that as far as the emigration of the Nansen refugees is concerned, there can be no question of overseas emigration. The solution of the Nansen refugees problem is a question of readaptation, assimilation and absorption in the countries where the refugees have sought shelter. They have been there about twenty years. To consider, as I have observed in various quarters, that the League of Nations must not concern itself with humanitarian work is an extremely dangerous step. Fortunately, France and Belgium are here to bear witness to the usefulness of the humanitarian work on behalf of the former emigration. The Balkan States are even more closely concerned with it. At the last Assembly, England strongly insisted on the necessity of maintaining this humanitarian work in its entirety. It is necessary strongly to emphasise that the new organisation has nothing to do with the Nansen refugees and nothing to do with the legal and political protection of the refugees on the whole: it is rather a technical question of emigration which must be resolved by this organisation.

In these circumstances, if you do not wish to pass a special vote, you should clearly state what Lord Winterton has expressed, so that there may be no confusion in the matter.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): Gentlemen, I should hope that the Committee would be satisfied with the statement that I made and that which Judge Hansson made; I think there is no real difference of opinion, and that we could leave the matter at that. I think we have already vividly in mind the need for the fullest co-operation.

Is there any other business ? If not, I have two announcements to make.

M. Henry Bérenger (France). (Translation): For my part I do not see anything else except to thank our Chairman for the extremely impartial manner in which he has conducted the debates, which, as they become more practical, sometime involve some delicate discussions.

We wish (and I believe, Gentlemen, that I am interpreting your sentiments) to thank our Chairman, Lord Winterton, for the distinguished way in which he has initiated his inter-governmental functions. He will allow me to associate with these thanks the name of the Honourable C. Myron Taylor, who recently was our Chairman at Evian, and to tell them both how happy and proud we are that they are taking an interest in such a work.

Lord Winterton (Chairman): Gentlemen, before I reply to Senator Bérenger's very kind words—which I will do in a moment—I have just two announcements to make. I suggest that the Committee should in a moment adjourn and that it should be left to the Chairman, that is to myself, to fix the date of the next meeting. It may be necessary to have a meeting, it probably will be necessary, in the autumn, to receive the report of the Director, but I think we all agree that in order to save expense and trouble to the members and the participating Governments we must only have a meeting when it is necessary. Is that agreed ?

(Agreed.)

The other suggestion I have to make is that a Press communiqué should be issued this afternoon, and that, before it is issued, it should be agreed upon between the Vice-Chairmen and myself.

(Agreed.)

Gentlemen, it merely remains my very pleasant duty to thank Senator Bérenger for what he said about me. I should like to mention—though I shall get into trouble with the individual for doing so, owing to the rules of the Civil Service—the most valuable service which I have had, and I am sure the whole Committee has had, from Mr. Makins, the Secretary, and to express on behalf of the Committee our thanks to him, and also to the other gentlemen, the experts of the different Governments who are present, who have helped us so materially.

(The Committee adjourned accordingly.)

(C8181) 180 10/58

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

L.I.C. 2nd meeting.

Copy no. 60

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE AND DEVELOP THE WORK OF THE EVIAN MEETING, LONDON, 1938.

(London Inter-Governmental Committee.)

DRAFT STENOGRAPHIC NOTES of the second meeting of the Committee, held in the Locarno Room, Foreign Office, S.W.1., on Thursday 4th August, 1938, at 11 a.m.

P R E S E N T :

UNITED KINGDOM.

The Right Hon. the Earl Winterton, M.P., Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster..... Chairman.

AUSTRALIA.

The Rt. Hon. S.M. Bruce, C.H., M.P. The High Commissioner for Australia.

Mr. A. Stirling.

BELGIUM.

M. de Foy.

M. J. Schneider.

BRAZIL.

Senhor Milton Cesar de Weguelin Vieira.

CHILE.

Señor Don Humberto Videla.

CUBA.

Señor Don Guillermo de Blanck, The Cuban Minister.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

Dr. Max Henriquez-Urena The Dominican Minister.

Dr. Ricardo Perez-Alfonseca.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

Dr. Don Manuel E. Malbran, G.B.E., The Argentine Ambassador.

UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. E. N. Cooper.

Mr. W. G. Hayter.

CANADA.

Mr. W. R. Little.

COLOMBIA.

Senor Don Luis Cano.

DENMARK.

M. Gustav Rasmussem.

ECUADOR.

Dr. Antonio Quevedo

Senor Alberto Puig-Arosemena.

Señor Hernan Pallares Ecuadorean Chargé d'Affaires.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Hon. Myron C. Taylor.

Mr. Robert Pell.

Mr. George Brandt.

Mr. Heyward Hill.

HONDURAS.

Señor Don Tiburcio Carias.

MEXICO.

Señor Gustavo Luders de Negri,
The Mexican Consul-General.

Señor Rafael Nieto.

NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. W. J. Jordan,
The High Commissioner for New Zealand.

Mr. C. B. Burdekin.

NETHERLANDS.

M. W.C. Beucker Andreae.

M. I.P. Hooykaas.

SWEDEN.

M. G.Engzell.

VENEZUELA.

Señor Julio Planchart.

FRANCE.

His Excellency M. Henry Bérenger,
Ambassador.

M. Bressy

M. Georges Coulon.

Le Baron de Watteville-Berkheim.

EIRE.

Mr. Sean Nunan.

NORWAY.

Judge Michael Hansson.

PANAMA.

Señor Eligio Ocana,
The Panamanian Consul-General.

PERU.

Señor Don Alfredo Benavides,
The Peruvian Minister.

URUGUAY.

Señor Cesar Montero de Bustamente.

Mr. R. M. Makins, Secretary to the Committee.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): Gentlemen, I have pleasure in calling upon Mr. Myron Taylor, the United States Delegate, to address the Committee.

MR. MYRON TAYLOR (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA): The Intergovernmental Committee, at its initial meeting at Evian, had a threefold objective.

First, it had to set up machinery, complementary to existing machinery, for negotiation between the country, or countries, of origin of involuntary emigrants, the countries of refuge and the countries of final settlement.

Second, it had to evaluate the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria, as to its extent and nature.

Third, it had to assemble data with regard to existing resources for absorbing the involuntary emigration.

The initial meeting was successful in establishing the machinery of negotiation, as our presence here and the election of a Chairman, four Vice-Chairmen and a Director yesterday attest. It was successful in eliciting information which enables us to determine the nature and size of the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany and Austria. It was successful in that it enabled the governments of refuge and settlement to give information as to the resources of which they dispose for absorbing involuntary emigrants and the contribution which each is prepared to make towards a positive solution of the harrowing problem with which we are concerned.

I am firmly convinced, in consequence, that we have reached the point now where we can enter successfully upon the substance of the problem, starting with the premises that a solution is possible and practicable and that this solution must be found in concert with all those who have an

interest in the elimination of a disturbing factor in contemporary international life. In other words, there must be an interchange between the country or countries whence come the involuntary emigrants, the countries where they find temporary refuge and the countries of final settlement. We must be frank to admit that without this interchange it will be difficult, if not impossible, to transform a disorderly exodus into an orderly emigration.

Predicating our approach to the problem on these premises, it is incumbent upon us to define the problem in terms of figures, based upon information which we have obtained from various reliable sources. In estimating the extent of the problem, it is essential for us to realise that the persons with whom we are concerned include those of the Jewish, Roman Catholic and the Protestant faiths, persons with no Church connections, persons of every profession and occupation, including industrial and agricultural workers. We should also consider, in our attempt to bring the problem within practicable limits, that older persons are, for the most part, not suited to the conditions of settlement in other countries and will evidently be provided for by remittances from those who have emigrated. They can, therefore, be eliminated from immediate consideration. With these factors in mind and by applying reliable age distribution percentages to census figures of Jews, and estimates of non-Aryans, according to the Nuremberg Laws, we come to the conclusion that there is a total of approximately 660,900 persons at present in Germany including Austria for whom opportunities for re-settlement must be found. This total includes approximately 198,100 Jews in the old Reich, subdivided into age groups of 16% of the total Jewish population between 0 and 20 years, or 54,300;

30 per cent between 20 and 45 years, or 106,700; 11 per cent between 45 and 50 years, or 37,100. Then there are approximately 102,300 Jews in the former Austria, subdivided in age groups of 11.2 per cent between 0 and 20 years, or 18,000; 65 per cent between 20 and 45 years, or 104,000. The non-Aryan totals are more difficult to establish, but, after careful analysis of the figures, we have come to the conclusion that there are approximately 75,000 Roman Catholics and a total is reached, as I stated above, of about 660,900.

Let us now turn to the occupational distribution of these potential emigrants. An examination of the occupational distribution of about 15,000 recent Jewish applicants for emigration from Germany indicates that 29 per cent were business men and office employees; 18 per cent were craftsmen; 6 per cent were of the liberal professions; 4 per cent were laborers; 4 per cent were domestic workers. It must be observed in this connection, however, that the intensification of agricultural training for young people in Germany in recent years suggests that the percentage of agricultural workers may from this time on be materially increased. I might add that an occupational classification of non-Jews including non-Aryans in former Austria, gives about 32 per cent engaged in agriculture.

The figures above together with the indications as to occupational distribution give us a clear picture of the extent and nature of the problem with which we are bound to deal.

Our next task is to determine the rate at which the potential emigrants leave in order that they may be absorbed

temporarily, in many cases, by the countries of refuge, and finally by the countries of settlement. Turning to the past, statistics show that the emigration of Jews from Germany before the absorption of Austria was at the rate of 22,000 annually in 1936 and 1937. If, for purposes of reaching a reliable estimate, we assume that Jewish emigration in those years bore a relationship to emigration of non-Aryans of two to one, we must conclude that total emigration from Germany was at the rate of approximately 30,000 to 33,000 persons in 1936 and 1937. Since the pressure has increased following upon the absorption of Austria, it may be assumed that emigration from Germany including Austria in 1938 may have reached a total of 40,000 persons. At this rate of emigration, the task of re-establishing 660,900 emigrants from Germany including Austria would require 16 years in time.

Evidently the plight of those who are the concern of the Inter-governmental Committee requires that the present process of emigration be accelerated. It should be accelerated to a point where the re-settlement may be realized possibly within the next five years. Accordingly, we must determine without further delay the total number of those who are obliged to leave Germany including Austria who can be absorbed annually elsewhere in the world.

To begin with, I believe that it is imperative that involuntary emigrants should be permitted to leave their country of origin with their property, in order that they may have means to meet the cost of transportation and of settlement at their final destination. This problem is one for the particular consideration of the Director who is instructed by the Resolution adopted at Evian "to undertake negotiations to improve present conditions of exodus and to

replace them by conditions of orderly emigration". It may, therefore, be premature at this time to do more than touch upon this question of funds required by involuntary emigrants.

In the second place, it must be conceded that the countries of refuge may continue to have to provide for a time some temporary asylum to involuntary emigrants on their way to final settlement. The countries of refuge have been most generous in this respect in the past and it is encouraging that their spokesmen at Evian gave assurances that they would continue to make a contribution, especially in the matter of training involuntary emigrants for settlement in countries of final destination.

The last word clearly must come from the countries of settlement. For its part the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1938, accepted approximately 17,000 involuntary emigrants from Germany for permanent residence. Moreover, my Government has expressed its willingness to admit in the current fiscal year emigrants from Germany, qualifying under its immigration laws and practices, to the full extent of the quota limitations, or 27,370. Other Governments whose national legislations do not admit immigrants under quota provisions were unable to state in advance the number which they might eventually admit. Many, however, gave indications as to the type of immigrants which they would receive and most offered to study the question sympathetically and to pursue specific inquiries to the end that they might share in the positive solution of the problem.

I am hopeful that in the interim following the meeting at Evian the representatives of the countries of settlement have had an opportunity to consult their governments further and will be prepared at this second

meeting to offer in confidence supplementary statements indicating specificially the part of the involuntary emigration which each is disposed to take.

To recapitulate, the line of our endeavor originates in the country or countries whence there is involuntary emigration, passes through the countries of refuge and ends in the countries of settlement. We must begin with orderly emigration from the country of origin over an allotted period. This requires negotiation with the Government of the country of origin which will be the immediate task of our Director. Then there must be a contribution by the countries of refuge, for example in the form of re-training of involuntary emigrants. Finally, there must be an equitable distribution of the involuntary emigrants in the countries of settlement. Each is a vital link in a chain which cannot be broken if we are to succeed.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): Gentlemen, the matter is now open for discussion.

MR. MYRON TAYLOR (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA): Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Director will sail on the 10th August and will probably arrive in London on the 15th or 16th of the month.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): As no other Representative appears to wish to join in the discussion now, I think it will be agreed that all the Committee can do for the moment is to take note of Mr. Taylor's most important and interesting statement.

As far as the United Kingdom is concerned, I do not think that I can usefully add to the statements made by me and my colleague, Sir Michael Palairet, at Evian, and the speeches which were made by Lord Plymouth in the House of Lords and by myself in the House of Commons in recent Debates

which we have had in our Parliament on the subject, as regards the part which H.M. Government in the United Kingdom are able to play in this problem.
H.M. Government, I might however say, have the matters which have been so very clearly and succinctly dealt with by Mr. Taylor in his speech constantly under consideration, but perhaps before I sit down I might make this further observation, that is earnestly to ask all members of the Committee to supplement as soon as possible and to the best of their ability the information which they handed in at Evian regarding the contribution which they are in a position to make to the problem before us in the directions indicated by Mr. Taylor. These statements should be communicated to the Chairman, and they will be circulated by him for the confidential information of the Committee and the Director.

Gentlemen, the next item on the Agenda consists of two questions which were left to this meeting of the Committee by the Resolution of the Evian Meeting.

The first of those matters is the allocation of expenses. The Evian Meeting recommended that this Committee should consider the scale on which its expenses should be apportioned among the participating Governments. I would suggest for the consideration of the Committee that it would be appropriate to adopt the scale upon which the expenses of the Evian Meeting were divided, and which was itself based on the scale

in use at Geneva in respect of contributions to the League of Nations and to the International Labour Office respectively.

I may say that the expenses of the Committee's meetings will be extremely small, and I understand that it is the intention to keep the expenses of the Director and his small personal staff at the lowest possible figure.

MR. MYRON TAYLOR (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA): Mr. Chairman, if there is to be discussion I should perhaps say beforehand that in response to enquiry I have found that the compensation of the Director, which formed the basis for his engagement, was stated by my Government to be something between 10,000 and 15,000 dollars, and of the Assistant Director 7,500 dollars, per annum. I think you would best have those figures in mind at this point.

M. HENRY BERENGER (FRANCE)(Translation): I would like to make a few observations.

We are entering a rather delicate part of our work, that which concerns the financial, and therefore budgetary contributions. As far as republican or democratic countries are concerned, with which we shall have to deal in this Inter-Governmental Committee, we have hitherto been bound by the Evian resolution.

If reference is made to Annex IV, page 54 of the text we see that paragraph (d) reads:

> "That the Governments of the countries of refuge and settlement should not assume any obligations for the financing of involuntary emigration".

This is a decision taken by the Evian Committee, and by which we are consequently bound. This wording may be interpreted in different ways. Does it refer to the financing of the transport of persons who are called involuntary emigrants (who are simply people expelled from their country), or does it refer to the financing of administrative and office expenses which might be involved over and above this exodus of refugees? This point is somewhat obscure, and will have to be cleared up.

On the other hand, we are also bound by paragraph (f) of this same Annex IV. On page 55 you will see the following:-

> "The Intergovernmental Committee, recognising the value of the work of the existing refugee services of the League of Nations and of the studies of migration made by the International Labour Office, shall co-operate fully with these organisations, and the Intergovernmental Committee at London shall consider the means by which the co-operation of the Committee and the Director with these organisations shall be established. The Intergovernmental Committee, at its forthcoming meeting at London, will consider the scale on which its expenses shall be apportioned among the participating Governments."

We have thus entered into a sort of undertaking, at any rate a moral one, to examine this question at this meeting in a certain form. That is precisely the purpose of the discussion which is now opened.

Finally, in Annex V we have the "Proposals by the Bureau regarding the expenses of the Intergovernmental Committee and their Allocation", which are similar to the plan for the allocation of expenses which was communicated to us just now. But this Annex V only takes into account the expenses of Evian, and does not refer to later expenses. It merely refers to the sharing of the small expenses made at Evian by the thirty-two governments represented there, for which, incidentally, the French Government made the provisional advance.

The question which is now raised becomes somewhat delicate. I have already had occasion, at Lausanne, in 1934, and later in Geneva, in different committees, in my capacity as French delegate, to present certain observations on behalf of my Government. We are dealing with a philanthropic work, which has been admirably described by the Honourable Myron C. Taylor on various occasions. It is also an important political task which is superimposed on the philanthropic work. I think, therefore, that the first observation I have to make, which I already made in 1934, 1935, and in 1937, is that the expenses which are to be fixed must be extremely small, in view of the fact that the unfortunate people whom for the present we must save and whom later we must re-establish, have no money. They are thrown out by the countries carrying out these expulsions, and they have been deprived of their fortune, and sometimes even of their clothes and furniture; they have nothing. They arrive completely stripped of everything, and the neighbouring countries are compelled to take them in. We know a good deal about it. So does Holland. The countries bordering on Germany - we can mention her name, since we are sitting in camera, -know what expenses this involves.

We are not only dealing with Germany. Spaniards are now arriving. To-morrow there will perhaps be others. We do not know.

These are extremely difficult problems. Any bureaucracy added to what the League of Nations has done (and it has

been well done; I must render them this tribute; they have made a magnificent effort) would, if the expenses are high, give rise to what we are accustomed to term in our assemblies "certain reactions".

I am taking the liberty of making that observation. I am compelled to make it on behalf of my Government, because I have neither the power nor the instructions to extend the expenses incurred at Evian, which were quite small, and for which my Government made the necessary advance, as I have mentioned already. I have no instructions to enlarge these to any considerable extent.

Now what we have at present is rather vague. I say it among ourselves; it is not for public consumption, or for the press, since we are carrying out our discussions in camera. I consider it rather vague, because, to put it quite bluntly, we have no budget forecast. You may tell me that a budget forecast is at the same time an anticipation expenditure sanctioned and also a forecast of receipts. You are well aware that we will not find many forecasts of receipts other than the contributions from the tax-payers whom we represent here, in the different countries. There remain the expenses. Now the economic and financial situation of the countries represented here is not good. Every country is trying to economise to the utmost of its powers, for it is on the balancing of their budgets that their life depends.

I would like to conclude these unduly lengthy remarks by a simple question: What is the forecast of expenses which is being submitted to us? At present we have the nomination of a Director and of an Assistant Director. These are two expenses, but would they be the limit? Is there a plan? If so, what is it? On behalf of my Government I am compelled to put up a barrier and to say: for the present I am compelled to wait, because I have not been shown a plan. We are accustomed to vote expenses on the basis of a forecast, and I believe this is the custom in every country. We would like to know where

we are going if you persevere in this direction.

M. GUSTAV RASMUSSEN (DENMARK) (Translation): I would like to ask whether it would not be possible to divide this question into two parts: 1) to lay down a precise definition regarding the nature of the expenses to be covered, i.e., if I am not mistaken, salaries and office expenses; and 2) to fix the maximum amount - this for reasons of a parliamentary nature. Some Governments would find it difficult to secure a vote for unspecified expenses.

MR. MYRON C. TAYLOR (U.S.A.): May I observe that the attitude of my Government is that the cost of the activity which shall be carried on by the Director should be the very minimum possible. There is no desire to expand his office into a large bureau. We should disapprove of that. The objective that we have sought to attain has been to get a suitable man with suitable experience in international matters who would be best fitted to contact with the Governments from which the emigrants will flow, and I am confident that, knowing so well the sympathetic heart of the Director who has been elected in humanitatian activity, that he would be the last one to consider the monetary question involved. On the other hand, there is a practical question in his instance because he has given so much of his time in the past without compensation to inter-governmental activities of one sort and another that I very reluctantly speak of the matter of compensation on his behalf at all, but I think that that is quite essential and on behalf of his assistant, I am sure, knowing his quality and capacity, that the amount that would be involved in that instance would be very very well expended in the interests of the results that we are seeking. It is very difficult for

anyone to estimate in advance the cost of an activity of this character, but I quite sympathise with Senator Bérenger and with the delegate who has spoken in their desire to have some rather definite limit put upon it. I have been a bit puzzled by this question myself and have asked myself whether we would accomplish the result that we desire if we allowed it to remain open until after the Director arrived when we might have another meeting of this Inter-Governmental Committee, but that only postpones matters. If there was an amount, an appropriate amount as the limit, the actual expenditure, of course, being subject to the approval of the Chairman, it seems that that might meet the situation. I think the particular participation by the countries represented would in any case not be large. The subjection of fixing an amount with a limit, but subject in its expenditure to the wisdom and discretion of the Chairman would seem to me to be a safe way to leave the question if we could arrive at an amount.

M. HENRY BERENGER (FRANCE) (Translation): The question which arises is this: the Director and the Assistant Director will not be able to work by themselves, for there are a number of things where help will be required. Presumably they have in mind a staff, and if possible we would like to know what that staff will be.

M. GUSTAV RASMUSSEN (DENMARK): May I add one word. I did not intend to criticise the amounts mentioned by Mr. Taylor.

MR. MYRON C. TAYLOR (U.S.A.): I realise that.

M. HENRY BERENGER (FRANCE) (Translation): Neither did I. I quite agree.

MR. MYRON C. TAYLOR (U.S.A.) If I may say our thoughts, so far as they have crystallised at all, have been that in addition to the Director and his Assistant, there would only be necessary one or two stenographers, not any other highly paid individuals, whatever stenographic help was necessary. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this. It has not been our conception and I am sure it has not been the conception of any member of the Committee that we were setting up an agency which would handle in any sense the detail of emigration. My conception is that we are engaged in defining principles and matters of great policy and not undertaking to administer activities. Is not that correct? Principles, and to negotiate with the Governments creating the situation, but not to undertake to indulge in detailed activities of the emigration itself.

M. HENRY BÉRENGER (FRANCE) (Translation): I entirely agree with the general lines envisaged, it seems, by our eminent Chairman the Honourable Myron C. Taylor. A great deal of work of this nature has been done. Those of us who have followed the work of the League of Nations and the work of the organisations which exist around the League of Nations know that a great many statistics have been worked out. Statistics are legion. I do not believe that it would serve any useful purpose to begin this work again, in view of the fact that there are thousands, and even hundreds of thousands or millions of unfortunate people who expect something more than statistics.

Thus I entirely agree with the Chairman and with Mr. Myron Taylor, and I am happy that we are adopting the course of getting into touch with the German Government. Let us call it by its name, since hitherto it is the only Government with which we are concerned. This does not necessitate a mass of special investigations. The question is the following. We do not suppose that the Director and Assistant Director will themselves take in hand pencil or pen and write their own correspondence. They therefore need a

minimum number of stenographers and typists. At present the expenses are as follows: 15,000 dollars on the one hand and 7,000 dollars on the other, i.e., a total of 22,000 dollars. This sum represents in the currency of my country 714,000, say 720,000 francs approximately. I hope you will forgive me for saying this in the course of this little debate. I know only too well what I can expect, as former Rapporteur of my country's budget, when I go back to France. For my part I am under the impression that, if we fix expenses at 30,000 dollars, there would remain 6,000 dollars for the shorthand and other work which might be required by the Director and Assistant Director. We should therefore have a basis. I take the liberty of suggesting or proposing this sum, but am open to contradiction. We could say to our Governments that we will participate on a proportional basis in a figure amounting to 30,000 dollars; since there are 22,000 dollars for the Director and Assistant Director, there would remain 6,000 dollars for the Staff, which need not be very large.

I apologise for expressing these views, but cannot do otherwise. We are not autocrats; we are subject to parliamentary habits and to the parliamentary commissions which control our accounts. We are constantly criticised on account of the League of Nations and of the very great expenses incurred. A moment arrives when we are compelled to consider figures, in view of the tremendous expenses which have been incurred on behalf of refugees, and of the sums spent every day by France, not only for the Germans, but also for the Spaniards.

I think that if we accepted the figure of 30,000 dollars at present for the expenses which might be incurred, these gentlemen could manage their affairs so as to conform with our vote.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): I think it would be for the convenience of the meeting if I attempted something in the way of summing up of the arguments that have been adduced by Mr. Taylor, Senator Bérenger and the representative of Denmark. I do not think that there need be any, or indeed, is any difference of opinion as to the meaning of the resolutions by which, as M. Bérenger very truly pointed out, we are bound at this meeting, our Government having accepted those recommendations. The first of the recommendations which M. Bérenger cited is recommendation (d) on page 54:

> "That the Governments of the countries of refuge and settlement should not assume any obligations for the financing of involuntary emigration".

That has been accepted by all the Governments and is inherent in the situation. The second recommendation to which I wish to call attention, recommendation (f), deals with the duties of the Director to be appointed at this meeting and I think it was implicit in the recommendation that that Director and the staff which he would require to perform his duties, should receive a salary. That, at any rate, was the impression left on my mind and that of the United Kingdom Delegation. I do not think there should be any difference of opinion there. The suggested duties of this Director are defined in this recommendation (f). The next question as it seems to me in order is the question of the allocation among the countries represented at this meeting of the scale of the expenses and I should hope that you would be willing to adopt the same allocation as that which we adopted at Evian; in other words, on the Evian scale. The last and most important point is the question of what the total amount

of these expenses should be, that is to say, the cost of the salary of the Director, of his Assistant, of a small clerical staff and of his office together with the expenses in which he would be involved in journeys which he may be required to make to Germany. So far as I know there will be no other expenses of any sort. Now it is not for me to judge as Chairman between the arguments which have been used, but I venture to hope that there is not any very great difference of opinion between those which have addressed the meeting. I have a suggestion to make; I want to make it clear it is only a suggestion, and that is this, that we should agree to a maximum sum in respect of this cost which I have just defined of $50,000, and that it should be left by a resolution of this meeting to the four Vice-Chairmen and myself to deal with the matter or to put it in other words, to arrange the cost within the limit of a maximum of $50,000, and I may say as a member of the British Government, I am as fully alive as anyone could be round this table to the need for saving, not only my Government but by the other Governments represented round this table too, saving them as much as possible in the matter of financial cost. I would venture to suggest to my friend, M. Bérenger, that possibly he might be willing to accept this figure of a limit of $50,000 in the confident expectation that if the meeting accepted the proposal the four Vice-Chairmen and myself would endeavour to arrange the matter on the most economical basis possible, having due regard to the need for paying a proper salary to this distinguished Director and his Assistant and in providing him with the necessary expenses.

M. HENRY BERENGER (FRANCE) (Translation): On behalf of my Government I made some observations which I fully realise were somewhat arid, and perhaps a little severe. It was my duty to do so. I need not repeat what the delegate from Denmark has already said. Along with this duty was implied a tribute for all those who have been chosen, incidentally by myself as well as by the others, to form the head of this Bureau. This tribute has been addressed to them, but you know full well that in questions of finance we must never allow questions of personalities to interfere.

We therefore remain on practical ground: the ground of the budgetary expenses, or, to put it more accurately, financial expenses which we must incur. It is not a budget; it is a forecast of expenses.

Our honourable Chairman, Lord Winterton, thinks that the maximum figure which I proposed was a little restricted. I entirely agree with him, but belonging to a poor nation, which is weighed down with burdens of all kinds, I am compelled to suggest something modest.

But if something a little larger can be allowed, I will not oppose it. None the less, I am compelled to say that I must refer the question to my Government. I do not indeed believe that they will contradict me, but I am compelled to make this reserve. It is a constitutional one. I am not entitled to bind France to incur expenses any more than the Government, incidentally, outside parliamentary usage. But subject to this reserve, which is one of form rather than of substance, I think that if the figure proposed by the Chairman is a maximum, a limit which will not be exceeded, we can make this gesture.

But we must then ask our Chairman, as well as the Director who will be nominated - who is already nominated and will soon arrive - that they do not consider this budget of 50,000 dollars compulsory expenses as happens in our national budgets. I have experienced this of old in French budgets:

if we were asked for 100 millions to carry out more or less urgent work, we could perhaps succeed in not spending the 100 millions a year provided in the budget, but it often happens that the head or director of the department may say: We have 100 millions; we must spend them cost what it may! And they then create Assistant Directors and all sorts of things, and in the end, as you know as well as I do, great difficulties are created in each nation's budget. I would not like to see this habit extended to inter-governmental matters, and I would like to ask our eminent Chairman, of whose wisdom and spirit of economy we are all well aware (he has amply proved it as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster) to consider this figure of 50,000 dollars as a maximum which need not necessarily be spent. If only 40,000 dollars were spent, it would be so much gained for the different countries and for the refugees. Perhaps the total of 50,000 dollars would not be reached. With this reserve, and on condition that the Bureau will be asked to examine this suggestion, I accept the proposal.

DR. DON MANUEL E. MALBRAN (ARGENTINE REPUBLIC) (Translation): I entirely agree with the remarks just made by Senator Bérenger. Usually when a certain sum is voted one is inclined to spend it.

As we are all here under similar circumstances, I would like to ask a question, which is merely meant to be a request: Would it not be possible for the Committee to authorise a sum of 30,000 dollars, and at the same time authorise a committee composed of the Chairman and the four Vice-Chairmen which, in case of need, might increase that sum from 30,000 to 50,000 dollars. This is not a proposal. I merely ask whether this would be possible.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): Perhaps my friend, the Argentine Ambassador would allow me to make a reply to the point he has put forward and which I think can best be met by suggesting a form of a recommendation which I hope the Committee might be willing to accept. When I have read out this suggested recommendation I think it might meet the point raised by the Argentine Ambassador. I suggest we might pass the following resolution; that this be a resolution to the participating Governments represented at the meeting:

> "That the cost of the salary of the Director, his Assistant, clerical staff, office and travelling expenses should not exceed 50,000 United States Dollars per annum and that the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman should, after consultation, be authorised to approve the provision of a sum within, and if possible, below that limit allocated among the participating nations on the Evian scale".

Perhaps I might add that that would be a clear indication to us to try and keep the expenses, if possible, lower than that sum.

MR. MYRON C. TAYLOR (U.S.A.): I am very happy to make that a motion.

JUDGE MICHAEL HANSSON (NORWAY) (Translation): I would like to say the same thing. It is a happy formula.

SENOR DON HUMBERTO VIDELA (CHILE): I have no power to accept this without referring it to my Government.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): That is in the resolution that this is a recommendation. It applies to all of us, it is a recommendation of the meeting to our Governments. I hope you will agree to make the recommendation. I take it that is the wish of the meeting?

AGREED.

May I then express the hope as Chairman that all my colleagues round this table will do their best to persuade

their Governments to agree to this recommendation.

There is one small matter I must now mention, that is the expenses of these meetings. It is calculated the expenses will be only a few pounds and I should hope it would not be necessary to have many meetings. Is it your wish that the expense should be allocated in the same way on the Evian scale. As the cost of these meetings will only be some £20, the amount between the Governments will not be very large. Is that agreed?

AGREED.

M. BENCHER ANDREAE (NETHERLANDS): May I ask one question. At what moment and in what way will the final fixation of the budget be communicated? Will there be such a moment? The reason we cannot fix an amount now is because we do not yet know exactly what it will be, but there will come a time when it will be possible to do so and then should there not be something arranged as to the way in which it will be communicated?

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): I am glad my colleague has raised this point. It is an important matter of detail. The decision which will be taken by the Vice-Chairmen and myself after, of course, talking to the Director will be communicated to the participating Governments round this table and I should hope it would be possible to make that decision within a comparatively short time.

The next item on the Agenda, to which I have already referred, arises out of the Resolution of the Evian Meeting, which recommended that this Committee should consider the means by which full co-operation should be established between the Committee and its Director on the one hand, and the Refugee Organisations of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office on the other. Well, I do not think this is a matter which need give rise to any difficulty, or which requires any formal resolution of any sort, The High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany and our Director have certain functions which are the special province of each. For example, the High Commissioner is concerned with the legal protection and status of refugees, and the Director with potential refugees still in Germany, and the negotiations with the country of origin. There is, however, a certain field of activity which is to some extent common to both individuals, notably in respect of the admission of refugees into countries of refuge and settlement, and the co-ordination of the work of the private organisations, which is incidentally a very important part and will be a very important part of his duties. I feel certain that the Director and the High Commissioner, who will both have their headquarters in London, will rapidly establish relations of mutual confidence, and it would be superfluous for this Committee to attempt to lay down any procedure of consultation; indeed, the principles of full co-operation have already been exploited at our Evian Meeting. I would suggest, therefore, that all we are called upon to do is to ensure that the High Commissioner and the Director are represented when matters common to both the Director and the High Commissioner are under discussion by this Committee. The same considerations also apply to the work of the International Labour Office. Again, the work of the Director may have some relation to the work which the International Labour Office is

doing on the question of migration, and we ought, I would submit to the Committee, to ensure that the International Office is represented when questions concerning migration are before this Committee. In conclusion, therefore, I would suggest, for the consideration of my colleagues, that in order to ensure the co-ordination of the work of this Committee, and its Director, with the Refugee services of the League of Nations, the High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany should be invited to be represented at the meetings of this Committee at which questions of migration of emigrants into countries of refuge and settlement and questions of private organisations are under discussion. Similarly, that the Director of the International Labour Office shall be invited to meetings of this Committee at which questions affecting migration are under discussion.

MR. MYRON C. TAYLOR (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA): Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with your thought that no resolution is necessary upon any part of this question at this time, and I am moved to make that observation for two reasons, the first of which is that we yesterday elected a Director, who is not yet present, and who, in his duties, should be associated with any obligation that might be put upon him by the Intergovernmental Committee; and for the second reason, that the League of Nations has indicated that it is, at the meeting, I think, of the 10th September, about to legislate with respect to this question, so that at the moment there is a hiatus which makes it rather difficult to appraise intelligently just what we should be undertaking to do if we resolved ourselves into some form of resolution at this time. The relationship which has existed between the League activity and the Intergovernmental Committee has been a most friendly and agreeable one, and our meetings

of the Intergovernmental Committee between now and the action of the League may be, probably will be, very few, perhaps none at all, at which, of course, as a matter of courtesy, the Chairman would have the privilege of inviting the representative of the League Authorities to be present, just as he did at our meeting of yesterday, so that I would like very much to suggest that except for these expressions we take no formal action in this matter at this time.

JUDGE MICHAEL HANSSON (NORWAY) (Translation): At Evian we decided that at the London meeting the Committee would examine the means whereby the relationship would be established between the Committee and the Director on the one hand and the different organisations of the League of Nations on the other. It seems to me that the Acting Chairmen have carried out this work, with the result that Lord Winterton has just described to us.

According to Annex IV, paragraph (f) of the document containing the Proceedings of the Evian meeting:

> "The Intergovernmental Committee, recognising the value of the work of the existing refugee services of the League of Nations and of the studies of migration made by the International Labour Office, shall co-operate fully with these organisations, and the Intergovernmental Committee shall consider the means by which the co-operation of the Committee and the Director with these organisations shall be established."

This formula is a happy one. It is a little vague, but it indicates sufficiently the object of our work, i.e. the clear distinction between the organisations of the League of Nations and everything pertaining to them and the very special task of the Intergovernmental Committee, which is to prepare for emigration on a large scale. This Conference should define the distinction so that there may be no confusion. I say this to clarify the matter.

I am sorry to note that there is already a certain confusion in the press, and people are beginning to speak of this Intergovernmental Committee and its work as though as if there

were a question of naturalising the new emigrants, of absorbing them and of assimilating them. All these questions already concern the Organisations and Secretariat of the League of Nations. In 1930 a unanimous resolution was taken, which provided that the legal protection of the refugees was the province of the secretariat. It is the humanitarian side of the work which was entrusted to the Nansen Office. In point of fact it is the Nansen Office and not the League of Nations which has done nearly everything; but if the impossible should happen, and it were decided at the next Assembly not to continue the work on behalf of the refugees in general, their protection would devolve entirely on the secretariat. I trust that we shall never reach this point, but a certain tendency none the less exists. The League of Nations has never liked this complex rôle. It costs a certain amount, even though it is not very much.

In the circumstances I was happy to learn of this formula which lays down that the co-operation between the League of Nations and the new organisation can only concern the special sphere of emigration. The League of Nations is not concerned with anything else. Why should the conference not say so to-day, since you have found a happy formula?

Now the International Labour Office has never been concerned with the practical side of emigration. By this happy phrase you emphasise that it is in this field that co-operation must apply. For the rest the Nansen Office must continue its activities. I take this opportunity of saying so, for I have already observed a certain anxiety among the refugees of the Nansen Office, which has always been supported by the League of Nations. It is a work of humanitarian character, but it is also a mixture of political, legal and purely humanitarian questions.

This question (up to what point must the Secretariat of the League of Nations support and help this former emigration?)

has been the subject of several discussions, but it has been observed more and more that as far as the emigration of the Nansen refugees is concerned, there can be no question of overseas emigration. It is a question of re-adaptation, assimilation and absorption in the countries where the refugees have sought shelter. They have been there about twenty years. To consider, as I have observed in various quarters that the League of Nations must not concern itself with humanitarian work is an extremely dangerous step. Fortunately, France and Belgium are there to bear witness to the usefullness of the humanitarian work on behalf of the former emigration. The Balkan States are even more closely concerned with it.

At the last Assembly, England strongly insisted on the necessity of maintaining this humanitarian work in its entirety. It is necessary to emphasise this, and that is why, too, it is so necessary to emphasise that this new organisation has nothing to do with political refugees: it is a technical question of emigration which must be resolved.

In these circumstances, if you do not wish to pass a special vote, you should clearly state what Lord Winterton has expressed, so that there may be no confusion in the matter.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): Gentlemen, I should hope that the Committee would be satisfied with the statement that I made and that which Judge Hansson made; I think there is no real difference of opinion, and that we could leave the matter at that. I think we have already vividly in mind the need for the fullest co-operation.

Is there any other business? If not, I have two announcements to make.

M. HENRY BERENGER (FRANCE) (Translation): For my part I do not see anything else except to thank our Chairman for the extremely impartial manner in which he has conducted the debates, which, as they become more practical, sometimes involve some delicate discussions.

We wish (and I believe, Gentlemen, that I am interpreting your sentiments) to thank our Chairman, Lord Winterton for the distinguished way in which he has initiated his intergovernmental functions. He will allow me to associate with these thanks the name of the Honourable C. Myron Taylor, who recently was our Chairman at Evian, and to tell them both how happy and proud we are that they are taking an interest in such a work.

LORD WINTERTON (CHAIRMAN): Gentlemen, before I reply to Senator Berenger's very kind words - which I will do in a moment - I have just two announcements to make. I suggest that the Committee should in a moment adjourn and that it should be left to the Chairman, that is to myself, to fix the date of the next meeting. It may be necessary to have a meeting, it probably will be necessary, in the autumn, to receive the report of the Director, but I think we all agree that in order to save expense and trouble to the members and the participating Governments we must only have a meeting when it is necessary. Is that agreed?

(AGREED).

The other suggestion I have to make is that a Press communiqué should be issued this afternoon, and that, before it is issued, it should be agreed upon between the Vice-Chairman and myself.

(AGREED).

Gentlemen, it merely remains my very pleasant duty to thank Senator Bérenger for what he said about me. I should like

to mention - though I shall get into trouble with the individual for doing so, owing to the rules of the Civil Service - the most valuable service which I have had, and I am sure the whole Committee has had, from Mr. Makins, the Secretary, and to express on behalf of the Committee our thanks to him, and also to the other gentlemen, the experts of the different Governments who are present, who have helped us so materially.

(The Committee adjourned accordingly).

L.I.C. 1.

Copy no. 55

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE AND DEVELOP THE WORK OF THE EVIAN MEETING, LONDON, 1938.

(London Inter-Governmental Committee.)

Press Communique of the 2nd meeting held in the Locarno Room, Foreign Office, S.W.1, on Thursday, 4th August, 1938, at 11 a.m.

The Inter-Governmental Committee to continue and develop the work of the Evian meeting held a further meeting in the Foreign Office this morning at 11. a.m.

The representative of the United States of America, Mr. Myron Taylor, made a statement to the Committee analysing the scope of the problem of emigration from Germany including Austria. The members of the committee will continue to exchange information as to the contributions which they are able to make in the co-operative effort to find a solution of the problem.

The Committee also discussed the two questions left to it by the Evian meeting. In regard to the first, namely the scale on which the expenses of the Committee should be apportioned among the participating governments, an agreed recommendation was made to the governments represented on the Committee.

As regards the second, namely the means for ensuring the co-operation of the Committee and its director with the refugee services of the League of Nations and the International Labour Office, the Committee accepted the view that, in order to ensure this co-operation, the High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany should be invited to be represented at the meetings of the Inter-Governmental Committee at which questions concerning the admission of involuntary emigrants into countries of refuge and settlement and questions concern-

ing the work of the private organisations are under discussion. Similarly the Director of the International Labour Office should be invited to be represented at the meetings of the Committee at which questions affecting migration are under discussion.

The Committee then adjourned, having instructed its Chairman to settle the date of its next full meeting.

August 4, 1938.

SPEECH

The Intergovernmental Committee, at its initial meeting at Evian, had a threefold objective.

First, it had to set up mcahinery, complementary to existing machinery, for negotiation between the country, or countries, of origin of involuntary emigrants, the countries of refuge and the countries of final settlement.

Second, it had to evaluate the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria, as to its extent and nature.

Third, it had to assemble data with regard to existing resources for absorbing the involuntary emigration.

The initial meeting was successful in establishing the machinery of negotiation, as our presence here and the election of a Chairman, four Vice Chairmen and a Director yesterday attest. It was successful in eliciting information which enables us to determine the nature and size of the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany and Austria. It was successful in that it enabled the governments of refuge and settlement to give information as to the resources of which they dispose for absorbing involuntary emigrants and the contribution which each is prepared to make towards a positive solution of the harrowing problem with which we are concerned.

I am ...

I am firmly convinced, in consequence, that we have reached the point now where we can enter successfully upon the substance of the problem, starting with the premises that a solution is possible and practicable and that this solution must be found in the collaboration of all those who have an interest in the elimination of a disturbing factor in contemporary international life. In other words, there must be a collaboration between the country or countries whence come the involuntary emigrants, the countries where they find temporary refuge and the countries of final settlement. We must be frank to admit that without this collaboration it will be difficult if not impossible to transform a disorderly exodus into an orderly emigration.

Predicating our approach to the problem on these premises, it is incumbent upon us to define the problem in terms of figures, based upon information which we have obtained from various reliable sources. In estimating the extent of the problem, it is essential for us to realize that the persons with whom we are concerned include those of the Jewish, Roman Catholic and the Protestant faiths, persons with no Church connections, persons of every profession and occupation, including

industrial ...

industrial and agricultural workers. We should also consider, in our attempt to bring the problem within practicable limits, that older persons are, for the most part, not suited to the conditions of settlement in other countries and will evidently be provided for by remittances from those who have emigrated. They can, therefore, be eliminated from immediate consideration. With these factors in mind and by applying reliable age distribution percentages to census figures of Jews, and estimates of non-Aryans, according to the Nuremberg Laws, we come to the conclusion that there is a total of approximately 760,900 persons at present in Germany including Austria for whom opportunities for re-settlement must be found. This total includes approximately 198,100 Jews in the old Reich, subdivided into age groups of 16% of the total Jewish population between 0 and 20 years, or 54,300; 30% between 20 and 45 years, or 106,700; 11% between 45 and 50 years, or 37,100. Then there are approximately 102,300 Jews in the former Austria, subdivided in age groups of 21% between 0 and 20 years, or 34,650; 41% between 20 and 45 years, or 67,650. The non-Aryan totals are more difficult to establish, but, after careful analysis of the figures, we have come to the conclusion that there are approximately 285,516 non-

Aryans ...

Aryans awaiting re-settlement. Add to this approximately 175,000 Roman Catholics and a total is reached, as I stated above, of about 760,900.

Let us now turn to the occupational distribution of these potential emigrants. An examination of the occupational distribution of about 15,000 recent Jewish applicants for emigration from Germany indicates that 29% were business men and office employees; 18% were craftsmen; 6% were of the liberal professions; 4% were laborers; 4% were domestic workers. It must be observed in this connection, however, that the intensification of agricultural training for young people in Germany in recent years suggests that the percentage of agricultural workers may from this time on be materially increased. I might add that an occupational classification of non-Jews including non-Aryans in former Austria, gives about 32% engaged in agriculture.

The figures above together with the indications as to occupational distribution give us a clear picture of the extent and nature of the problem with which we are bound to deal.

Our next task is to determine the rate at which the potential emigrants leave in order that they may be absorbed temporarily, in many cases, by the countries of refuge, and finally by the countries of settlement.

Turning ...

Turning to the past, statistics show that the emigration of Jews from Germany before the absorption of Austria was at the rate of 22,000 annually in 1936 and 1937. If, for purposes of reaching a reliable estimate, we assume that Jewish emigration in those years bore a relationship to emigration of non-Aryans of two to one, we must conclude that total emigration from Germany was at the rate of approximately 30,000 to 33,000 persons in 1936 and 1937. Since the pressure has increased following upon the absorption of Austria, it may be assumed that emigration from Germany including Austria in 1938 may have reached a total of 40,000 persons. At this rate of emigration, the task of re-establishing 760,900 emigrants from Germany including Austria would require 19 years in time.

Evidently the plight of those who are the concern of the Intergovernmental Committee requires that the present process of emigration be accelerated. It should be accelerated to a point where the re-settlement may be realized possibly within the next five years. Accordingly, we must determine without further delay the total number of those who are obliged to leave Germany including Austria who can be absorbed annually elsewhere in the world.

To ...

To begin with, I believe that it is imperative that involuntary emigrants should be permitted to leave their country of origin with their property, in order that they may have means to meet the cost of transportation and of settlement at their final destination. However, the Director is instructed by the Resolution adopted at Evian "to undertake negotiations to improve present conditions of exodus and to replace them by conditions of orderly emigration". It may, therefore, be premature to do more than touch upon this question of funds required by involuntary emigrants.

In the second place, it must be conceded that the countries of refuge may continue to have to provide for a time some temporary asylum to involuntary emigrants on their way to final settlement. The countries of refuge have been most generous in this respect in the past and it is encouraging that their spokesmen at Evian gave assurances that they would continue to make a contribution, especially in the matter of training involuntary emigrants for settlement in countries of final destination.

The last word clearly must come from the countries of settlement. For its part the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, accepted approximately 17,000 involuntary emigrants from Germany for permanent

residence ...

residence. Moreover, my Government has expressed its willingness to admit in the current fiscal year emigrants from Germany, qualifying under its immigration laws and practices, to the full extent of the quota limitations, or 27,370. Other Governments whose national legislations do not admit immigrants under quota provisions were unable to state in advance the number which they might eventually admit. Many, however, gave indications as to the type of immigrants which they would receive and most offered to study the question sympathetically and to pursue specific inquiries to the end that they might share in the positive solution of the problem.

I am hopeful that in the interim following the meeting at Evian the representatives of the countries of settlement have had an opportunity to consult their governments further and will be prepared at this second meeting to offer in confidence supplementary statements indicating specifically the part of the involuntary emigration which each is disposed to take.

To recapitulate, the line of our endeavor originates in the country or countries whence there is involuntary emigration, passes through the countries of refuge and ends in the countries of settlement. We must begin with orderly emigration from the country of origin over an

allotted ...

allotted period. This requires negotiation with the Government of the country of origin which will be the immediate task of our Director. Then there must be a contribution by the countries of refuge, for example in the form of re-training of involuntary emigrants. Finally, there must be an equitable distribution of the involuntary emigrants in the countries of settlement. Each is a vital link in a chain which cannot be broken if we are to avoid catastrophe.

Arch - for consideration

London, August 9, 1938.

As a result of the experience which we have gained through several months of contact with refugee problems, including particularly the Jewish exodus from Germany, including Austria, it is quite evident that unless the internal political affairs of many states subside, the refugee problem, racial, political and religious, may assume unmanageable proportions, and that effective work by the various relief organizations would be inadequate to cope with such a migration of large bodies should they occur concurrently.

As information respecting these matters becomes more crystalized in our minds, and by devoting full time to it, it naturally raises the question of the relation, present and future, of the different government activities, especially as concerns our own Government, with reference to these problems. It might be well therefore to review briefly the principal official activities as they stand at the moment, with special reference to the reorganization of the Nansen Committee and the League High Commissioner's activities as a feature of the League of Nations policies.

If you will read the record of the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee at Evian, and also of those held in London, which are transmitted herewith, you will observe how carefully I protected the relationship of the Intergovernmental Committee to existing League activities. This was because in our first approach to the problem at Evian and at informal preliminary meetings in Paris with representatives of Great Britain, it was quite obvious that their then attitude, as well as that of their adherents in other nations, was directed to either referring the Intergovernmental Committee's further actions to the League authorities, or, failing that, to making of the Intergovernmental Committee an advisor to the League of Nations authorities. Both of these efforts were avoided by the results which we achieved at Evian and also in London.

I would call your particular attention to a ~~statement~~ declaration which I made in respect to the statement of Lord Winterton, the Chairman, at the London meetings.

The League meets September 13th. Last night, at a dinner given by Sir Neill Malcolm, the present High Commissioner for Refugees of the League, at which he brought together a rather ill chosen group, the subject uppermost

in his mind for discussion considered, he brought out for round table discussion the whole question of refugees, involving Spain, Czekoslovakia, Rumania, Poland, etc. The Czekoslovakian Minister was present, as were two or three others who were not directly connected with our present activity, and both the British and ourselves took the position that at the moment we could not take up any further question than that of Germany, because in truth that has assumed proportions and complexities which for the immediate future at least will require our very best effort and attention. It would be most unwise to go further afield and invite new difficulties, the magnitude of which goes even beyond those which confront us in Germany.

I have taken the position in all of the informal discussions, as well as in the public ones, that the Intergovernmental Committee in its preliminary form, and now in its more permanent form, has engaged upon a study of the problem for the moment ~~including~~ of Germany ~~and~~ including Austria, and that it was not our function to consider particular cases involving either small or sizable numbers, but rather to discover places of settlement, especially of larger numbers, a release of the funds of proposed emigrants which have been appropriated by Germany, in order that settlement might be accomplished, at least in part, at the expense of the emigrants, and a

more systematic exodus covering such a period of years as would admit of its accomplishment in an orderly manner; meantime if possible to persuade Germany to extend toward the proposed emigrants a more humane procedure.

It is unquestionably true that the arrest, the confinement in prisons and concentration camps, the heavy labor forced upon those unaccustomed to it, the methods of driving physically unfit men to hard tasks, the inadequate and low quality of food provided ~~for~~ at such concentrations, are daily not only bringing about the death of many but are leading others to suicide.

From our last speech in London you will observe that we had spent time in studying such records as are available, to discover ~~to~~ composition of the number of Jews and non-Aryans in Germany, within various age groups. Out of the conversations which we have had and such studies as indicated, it has seemed to us that if we ~~concentrated~~ focused our thoughts in the first instance upon the age group between the ~~years~~ ages of 15 and 45 we might evolve a proposal on which, if places of settlement were found for sizable numbers, we might meet the German government with something definite, in the hope of securing their cooperation for an orderly exodus of that group over a period of five years. From the information at hand we are not able to state (a) the numbers be-

tween the ages of 15 and 45 who are incapacitated and unable to move; (b) the number of men and the number of women; and (c) those who for ~~other~~ various reasons would be undesirable in any new environment. And so it results that, even though there were an acceptance on the part of the German government of a proposal looking to the emigration of such small numbers, in actual practice, for reasons of self protection to the countries of settlement, it would have to be on a selective basis. It therefore follows that the numbers to be actually dealt with would be reduced substantially from those indicated in our last speech above referred to.

Meantime we learned yesterday that Germany has issued a decree that no person under 45 years of age would be permitted to leave the country without the consent, first, of the police, and, secondly, that of the military authorities, which would seem to indicate that all who are useful for military service in any of its branches might be restrained from leaving the country at the present time. This may bear some relation to the very serious condition of affairs which exists on the Continent and which in official circles here and in Paris is taken to be one filled with very great danger. I am confident that the situation which I recorded in the message from Paris with respect to the preoccupation of the Foreign Office there is shared by the

Foreign Office here, as was definitely confirmed to me last week in a conversation privately had with X.

If these several elements are taken together, it would seem that it may be likely that our efforts in a practical way, even though we found places of settlement for substantial numbers, would be retarded in action; and I should imagine that in the event of conflict the borders of the countries involved would be closed, and that nothing could be done, while within such countries the potential emigrants would unquestionably be put to work in support of the activities of the country of ~~origin~~ nationality.

Coming to the other feature, the meeting of the League of Nations in September, it will be our endeavor to forward to you prior to its meeting the proposed plan under which the activities of the Nansen Office and those of the office of the High Commissioner for Refugees will be suggested for consolidation.

It will be important for you also to consider just what relationship you would approve the Intergovernmental Committee assuming with respect to that activity.

As regards the Intergovernmental Committee itself: Its origin, prompted by humanitarian motives, did not fail to inspire a respect for our President, our Secretary of

State, and our country. But in its first aspects it was not met with any enthusiasm. As we gradually built up a sentiment around it, and began to define in simple terms the existing problems and the possibilities of the future, we accomplished before leaving Evian a very definite interest in the work of the Intergovernmental Committee. In calling a meeting in London for the purpose of permanent organization it was obvious that trade relations between many countries and Germany were a factor which was prominent in many minds, and, as you are aware, several countries, in the first instance at least, failed of representation. Both in Kept interest alive and more opte at our final division which we gave to round out the meeting on a high note of cooperation.

In the smaller group, of Chairman, four Vice Chairmen and Director we evolved a possibility for collaboration in a simple way, without any designation as a committee, and created what seemed ~~to me~~ to be a very useful means for inter-governmental discussion and cooperation--useful particularly at this time, when the world is faced with many uncertainties.

It must be borne in mind that the group which I have mentioned, representative of Great Britain, France, the United States, the Low Countries, and South America, have

been given no authority to act for the Intergovernmental Committee, and that was avoided because of its possible implications, so that the group is so loosely tied together that it cannot become the subject of criticism, either within or without the Intergovernmental Committee, and at the same time, through meetings held at intervals, can be very helpful to the Chairman and the Director and very useful to the several members as a means of communication with respect to the problems concerned.

I think it should be borne in mind also that, the permanent intergovernmental committee having been created, no matter how complete or effective an organization the League of Nations may set up, it is quite likely that the Intergovernmental Committee as such might be found to be useful as a continuing body for purposes of study consultation, study or advice on the questions involved, ~~or any other questions which it might be desired to submit to it.~~

I have considered it advisable, without asking for your reaction at the moment upon any of these matters, to put before you these reflections, so that you may have them in mind as matters develop, concerning which in each instance we will as occasion demands follow previous procedure of seeking your direction.

In order to understand the question of the dispersion

of Jews throughout the world, I asked when Mr. Bentwitch came to see me in Florence to have charts prepared which would show many important features. This I did not use at Evian, though I had intended to do so, because it presented so large a picture of Jewry, not to speak of non-Aryans, that I felt we had best, until we were organized, confine our attention to more generally known facts and specifically to the German-Austrian situation. So I undertook to pay for these charts myself, and withdrew them from use at that time. I am sending herewith four copies for your information. As a result of recent conversation I placed one copy in the hands of Mr. X. this week, and he has just written me that he found it of very great interest.

[redacted]

L.I.C. 4.

Copy no. 1

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE AND DEVELOP THE WORK OF THE EVIAN MEETING, LONDON, 1938.

(London Inter-Governmental Committee).

Copy of a letter dated 19th August, 1938, to the Chairman of the Committee from the Chairman of the United States of America Delegation.

EMBASSY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In my technical statement to the meeting of the Inter-Governmental Committee at London on August 4, 1938, I indicated that the Committee might have to concern itself with the re-establishment of approximately 660,000 involuntary emigrants from Germany including Austria. This total included Jews, non-Aryans and others between the ages of 0 and 45 years. Evidently, in this number there would be many who, on account of various disabilities, would be incapacitated for resettlement. There would be many persons who, for a multitude of reasons, would prefer not to leave the country of origin. Finally, there would be many children and women who would follow, not accompany, the first waves of emigration. It might, in consequence, be that our immediate problem would consist in the need to resettle approximately 300,000 people in a first period, say of five years.

Assuming that this is a fair statement of the problem, I am authorized by my Government to inform you that there is no reason to believe, conditions remaining what they are, that the acceptance by the United States of America of involuntary emigrants from Germany, including Austria, appearing and qualifying for admission into American territory under the Immigration Laws of the United States, will be discontinued or restricted during the period contemplated.

The American Immigration Laws do not permit a representative of the American Government to enter into an agreement to accept a specified number of involuntary emigrants as such, from Germany including Austria, for a specific period of time. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the United States has been, and is, receiving a considerable number of persons in this category, many more, it is believed, than are received by any other country. According to the latest information, the four American Consular Offices in Germany charged with issuing immigration visas for the United States are now issuing such visas at a rate of over 20,000 per annum to persons who are in fact involuntary emigrants. In addition, they are issuing a smaller number of immigration visas to such persons who are exempted under the laws from the numerical or quota restrictions. In view of the foregoing, therefore, it would appear that the United States will, in the contemplated period of five years, take over 100,000 involuntary emigrants or more than one third of the total number of those with whom the Committee must deal.

In view of the contribution which the United States of America is prepared to make towards the solution of the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria, it is the earnest hope of my Government that the governments of the other countries of final settlement will in each case be prepared to offer a statement, as precise as may be possible, indicating the number of involuntary emigrants from Germany including Austria whom it is prepared to receive so that a definite plan for the resettlement of these persons in a period of five years may be formulated as a basis upon which further steps may be taken towards a solution of the problem which is the special responsibility of the Inter-Governmental Committee.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed) MYRON C. TAYLOR,

Chairman, Delegation of the
United States of America.

The Right Honorable
The Earl Winterton,
Chairman, Inter-Governmental Committee.

Foreign Office,
London, S.W.1.

20th August, 1938.

PART A.

Transfer of Jewish and Non-Aryan Property
from Germany including Austria.

August 15, 1938

TRANSFER OF JEWISH AND NON-ARYAN PROPERTY
FROM GERMANY INCLUDING AUSTRIA

Part A.1 Jewish Emigration and Transfer of Jewish Property since 1933.

At the outset, a distinction must be made between unorganized individual emigration (of non-Aryans and Aryans) with the transfer through the sale of sperrmarks and emigration as organized by Jewish initiative divided in two groups: emigration to Palestine and emigration to other countries.

2) Unorganized individual emigration and transfer of property through the sale of sperrmark.

Since the introduction in the summer of 1931 of currency restrictions in Germany, various types of sperrmark have been created including the "emigrants'sperrmark" i.e. credit accounts in reichsmark left behind by emigrants. This "emigrants'sperrmark" was negotiated on the stock exchanges abroad as one of the principal types of sperrmarks beside the "credit sperrmark" and the "Effekten sperrmark". Up to June, 1938, when the acquisition of emigrants' sperrmarks was prohibited, the sale of emigrants' sperrmark was the only means of capital transfer for unorganized individual emigration, the procedure being that the prospective emigrant whether Aryan or not, after having gone through the usual formalities preceding emigration and after having paid the taxes imposed upon him, had but to convert his property into cash to be paid into a bank. He then was free to leave and (though with heavy losses) to sell these emigrants' sperrmarks through any foreign bank, the counter-value in foreign currency being the yield of the transfer at his free disposal. The buyers of these emigrants' sperrmark accounts were frequently foreign importers of German goods who held a concession from the German authorities allowing them to pay part of their bills with sperrmarks. For some time past, however, all these concessions have been cancelled by the German authorities with the result that the only buyers on the market of emigrants' sperrmarks were the German Reichsbank and its associate, the German Golddiskont-Bank, or foreign banks acting on their behalf. This fact accounts for the tremendous drop in the rate of exchange down to 8% of this type of sperrmark, as shown in exhibit No. 1, for the very reason that there was no normal market but a rate of exchange dictated by one buyer only.

3) The above-mentioned prohibition in June 1938 of the purchase of emigrants' sperrmarks has completely obviated all transactions abroad with this type of sperrmark. To-day, the German Gold-Diskont-Bank may occasionally buy small quantities of "emigrants' sperrmark" in Germany at a rate of 8% which involves a loss of 92% for the emigrant.

This prohibition of the transfer through the sale of emigrants' sperrmarks constituted the most severe handicap to emigration, the implications of which were not fully realized by the public in the countries receiving refugees.

4) As set out below, organized emigration with capital to any

...measurable

measurable extent did not exist up to June, 1938, except for emigration to Palestine and for the transfer of sums not exceeding £5,000, while the scale of these operations was not nearly commensurate with the actual needs. Large numbers of prospective emigrants with destinations other than Palestine or with more than £5,000 to be transferred had no other choice but to sell their sperrmarks, a simple and speedy method, but one involving heavy financial losses. The fact that of 135,000 persons who emigrated from Germany since 1933, not more than some 40,000 went to Palestine, goes to show that the majority of the other 95,000 could not but transfer on their own whatever savings they had through the sale of emigrants' sperrmarks. The prohibition of the sale of sperrmarks has now brought this method of individual emigration to a complete standstill.

5) The considerable loss in emigrants' sperrmark which eventually reached 92%, has enabled the Reichsbank to record particularly large gains in reichsmark. £100, for instance, derived from the export of goods, which the Reichsbank used for the acquisition of emigrants' sperrmark have cost the Reichsbank appr. 375 RM instead of 250 RM (the official rate of exchange), making allowance for a rather ample estimate of an average export bonus of 50%. For these £100 the Reichsbank could acquire RM 3,125, - in emigrants' sperrmarks at a buying rate of 8%. After deducting the initial RM 375 the Reichsbank was left with a clear profit of RM 2,750 for every £100, which is eleven times the officially quoted value. These profits may possibly have been utilized for the financing of Germany's export premiums.

6) The annual turnover of emigrants' sperrmarks is estimated by experts at several hundred million marks.

Capital Transfer for organized Jewish Emigration.

7) As mentioned above, Jewish emigration is classified into two groups: emigration to Palestine and emigration to other countries. The results of emigration and of the considerable volume of capital transfer to Palestine through the "Haavara Transfer System" are of particular importance and will be dealt with in detail in paragraph 12.

8) Unlike the Haavara transfer system which is based on the export of goods from Germany to Palestine, an organized transfer of capital to other countries on the same basis could not be achieved despite all efforts in this direction. Therefore, the foreign currency required for this transfer system, had to be procured on a purely financial basis through a clearing arrangement with the relief remittances of Jewish relief organizations abroad, and through the acquisition of the so-called "German Ruckwanderer-Devisen". German citizens (Aryans) living abroad and returning to Germany were allowed, as a stimulus for their return, a higher reichsmark rate when delivering the foreign currency in their possession in order to assist them in re-establishing themselves in Germany. It may be assumed that as a rule, the Gold-Diskont-Bank has allowed a premium of up to 50% on the official rate for this purpose. The foreign currency thus acquired (known as Dego-Devisen) were ceded in 1936-1937 to the "Altreu Transfer System" for an organized emigration of people

... with

with and without capital, the Gold-Diskont-Bank charging 100% on the official rate which not only covered the 50% premium to be paid to the returning German immigrants, but left the Gold-Diskont-Bank with a clear 50% profit in reichsmark.

9) "Altreu" thus had - about one year ago - several million goldmarks at its disposal which were made available under a special system arranged with the German authorities to prospective emigrants, preferably to large families. A family of four could obtain a maximum of 50,000 reichsmark to be paid out at a rate of 30%, i.e., with a transfer loss of 70%. The actual yield therefore amounted to 15,000 goldmarks = roughly £6,000. Smaller families or single emigrants obtained proportionately less and at a higher transfer loss. The profits derived from this transfer loss were utilized for the equipment and emigration of poor emigrants who in the absence of any means of their own were to receive a grant of about £375 per head free of charge to assist their re-establishment in their newly adopted country.

10) There being but a few million goldmarks available in this way, the heavy rush of Jewish emigrants who wished to avail themselves of this transfer opportunity caused this system to be halted after a few days. All efforts to secure from the German authorities a subsequent regular supply of larger quantities of "Dego-Devisen" have so far remained unsuccessful. Consequently, organized emigration to countries other than Palestine and the transfer of capital through the Altreu transfer system is at present confined to the possibilities afforded by the clearing with the remittances of foreign Jewish relief organizations, a method which is utterly inadequate to meet the needs.

11) When examining the question whether the Inter-Governmental Committee can, with some chances of success, take steps to enlist Germany's co-operation on a commercial basis for the transfer of Jewish emigrants' capital, special attention must be paid to the complete failure of all previous efforts to introduce a transfer system based on the export of goods to countries other than Palestine. Unless the German authorities as well as the Governments and consumers of the import countries abandon their present attitude and take a more favorable view towards larger imports of German goods, any future attempts of transfer based on the export of goods are likely to be doomed to failure

12) <u>Organized Emigration and Transfer of Capital from Germany to Palestine (Haavara Transfer System).</u>

In November, 1933, the <u>Trust and Transfer Office Haavara Ltd. Tel Aviv</u> (Haavara is the Hebrew word for transfer) was set up together with its sister organization "Palaestina Treuhand-Stelle zur Beratung der Juden in Deutschland G.mb.H." (Paltreu), and it will soon have completed the fifth year of its activities. During this period, the Haavara has transferred <u>approx. 130 million reichsmark</u> of Jewish emigrants' property to Palestine where roughly 37.5 million dollars were paid out. The transfer loss was only 5% at the outset, but, for reasons set out further on, had to be gradually increased and has now reached 50%. Of more than 40,000 German Jews who emigrated to Palestine since 1933, the majority owe their successful emigration to this transfer system.

...13) <u>The</u>

13) The Haavara Transfer Organization

The legal basis of the Haavara transfer is constituted by a decree promulgated by the German authorities concerned which provided that bills for exports to Palestine may be paid c.i.f. Palestinian port out of reichsmark holdings which emigrating German Jews had deposited with the Haavara (Haavara mark). This procedure - enabling the purchase of German goods by Jewish consumers in Palestine through the sanction of the Jewish Agency - has resulted in a certain collaboration between the German authorities and the Jewish organizations concerned. There was in fact a sort of emigration and transfer contract between the German Government and the Jewish Agency for Palestine which the German authorities have recognized up till to-day.

14) The sources of the Haavara transfer were:

a) transfer of goods through paying the bills of German exporters to Palestine and, to a smaller extent, to Iraqi and Egypt;

b) financial transfer through the clearing of grants made by Jewish relief organizations abroad and of benevolent remittances by individual Jews abroad to Jewish relatives and friends in Germany.

On an average, the Haavara could derive about 75% of its transfer proceeds from the payment of bills for German exports to Palestine, and only 25% from the transfer of goods to other countries of the Near East and from all available opportunities of financial transfer.

15) The technical organization of the Haavara represents an internationally organized transfer machinery which is built up as follows:-

Haavara Ltd. Tel Aviv
as centre

for the commercial tasks			for the administrative tasks	
transfer of goods for Palestine:	transfer of goods for the Near East:	financial transfer	Germany	Palestine
Haavara Ltd. Tel Aviv	Haavara Ltd. Baghdad	Intria Ltd. London	Palteru Berlin	Haavara Ltd. Tel Aviv

Haavara Ltd. which acts as the central organization is owned by the Jewish Agency for Palestine. The Haavara in its turn holds all shares of the above-mentioned Hanico Ltd. (Near and Middle East Commercial Corporation), and of the Intria Ltd. (90, Queen Street, London, E.C. 4). The Intria is chiefly concerned with financial transfer and has to maintain the contact with the authorities and Jewish organizations outside Palestine. The shares of the Paltreu G.m.b.H., the Berlin administrative organization, are owned by the hitherto Jewish banking firms M. M. Warburg & Co., Hamburg-Berlin; A. E. Wassermann, Berlin, and the Anglo-Palestine Bank Ltd., as trustees of the Jewish Agency. All institutions of the Haavara transfer system act merely as trustees for the transfer of the Jewish property placed with them, declining any commercial risks on their part, and working on an absolutely non-profitmaking basis.

16) Transfer Losses of the Emigrants to Palestine.

The sums transferred by Jewish emigrants through the Haavara are subject to deductions for

a) Bonus paid by the Haavara for the imported goods.

Normally, the German Government grants an export bonus to exporters so as to enable them to keep the prices of their exports at the level of the world market price. In the case of Haavara exports, however, the exporter is excluded from these bonuses, but is entitled to charge proportionately higher prices to his Palestinian clients. Consequently, Palestinian importers, when buying the Haavara marks required for the settlement of their bills, claim a corresponding discount to make up for the difference between the higher German prices they have to pay and the Palestinian prices. This price difference (Haavara bonus) which rose in proportion to the constantly increasing German export premiums, averages now 40-45%.

b) Loss of exchange in the clearing with benevolent remittances.

This type of transfer is bound to bring the Haavara mark into competition with the German registered mark which is used by non-Jewish foreigners for benevolent remittances to non-Jews in Germany. The registered mark being officially negotiated with a discount of at present 53%, the Haavara mark, too, has to be sold with a similar loss.

c) Administrative expenses of the transfer organizations, which owing to the comparatively high transfer turnovers could be kept at an average of only 2 - 2.5% of the turnover.

These three contingencies were responsible for a transfer deduction which at the outset could be fixed at 5%, but ever since 1934 had to be gradually raised to 10, 15, 25%, until in February, 1937, it had to be fixed at 38% which rate was in force till the 30th June, 1938. During this period, the minimum capital of

....£5,000

£5,000 required for the emigration to Palestine under the "capitalist category" was transferred by the Haavara for 20,000 marks. It was only in connection with the ever increasing difficulties regarding the transfer of German goods that the transfer loss had now to be raised to 50%.

17) Distribution system of the transfer proceeds in Palestine:

a) About 75% of the transfer proceeds were used for the capital transfer of individual capitalist emigrants with a maximum capital of at present £5,000 per family, while in individual cases, if necessary, an additional amount of some hundred pounds could be transferred for the agricultural settlement of Jewish middle-class emigrants.

b) About 25% of the transfer proceeds were assigned:

1) to the Zionist funds for the transportation and absorption of emigrants without means (principally young persons);

2) for fees for schools and the university in Palestine for pupils whose parents were still in Germany;

3) for pensions of officials whose emigration to Palestine following their involuntary retirement had no other financial foundation than their claim on their pension;

4) for private relief remittances of Jews in Germany to their needy relatives in Palestine;

5) for expenses in Palestine of tourists who wished to visit Palestine for information purposes prior to their emigration to that country.

Thus all requirement including a tourist traffic arrangement could be provided for out of the transfer proceeds of the Haavara.

18) Haavara Transfer Turnover.

The Haavara transfer turnover has so far reached 130 million reichsmark, for which a counter-value of about £37,500,000 was paid out. This includes the equivalent in foreign exchange of some 40 million reichsmark which the German Reichsbank, particularly in 1933-1934, supplied out of its own resources for the Palestine transfer. Nevertheless, the transfer capacity of the Haavara has not nearly been sufficient to satisfy all those German Jews who had registered with the Haavara for the transfer of their capital. The highest annual transfer turnover ever attained by the Haavara was that of 1937 when its transfer proceeds amounted to nearly 34 million reichsmark, including an amount of 2 million reichsmark in foreign exchange supplied by the Reichsbank. During the first half of 1938, the Haavara was still able, despite the increasing restrictions imposed on its concession for the transfer of German goods (as described under 19) to transfer about 12 million marks through its own efforts, while foreign exchange of the Reichsbank was no longer available for the transfer of emigrants' property.

....19) The

19) The present difficulties of the Haavara system:

As explained in the previous paragraphs, it has been possible, over a period of five years' constructive work, to set up a system for emigration and capital transfer on an international export and financial basis. The assets of this internationally organized machinery are: a wealth of exceedingly valuable experience; a trained staff who master the intricate subject of the transfer of goods as well as the financial transfer. Given the necessary concessions for a wider scope, this machinery could easily yield far higher results than those of the record year 1937. However, the uncertainty of the political future of Palestine and the growing shortage of raw materials and foreign exchange in Germany have caused the Haavara transfer concession to be constantly curtailed by the German Government ever since the middle of 1937. Ultimately, in February, 1938, such restrictions were imposed and are taking effect as from the 1st August, 1938, as to whittle down the transfer concession of the Haavara to a small number of goods of mostly secondary importance, and to the financial transfer. The Jewish Agency has made every effort to impress upon the German authorities that through these measures the only existing workable basis for a mass emigration of Jews from Germany will be rendered ineffective at a time when the extension of this transfer organization to Austria could be instrumental in the immediate mobilization of Austrian emigrants. For various reasons, however, a final decision of the German Government with regard to the re-activation of the Haavara transferhas so far not been forthcoming.

Despite the disturbances, there is still a steady demand for imported goods in Palestine to a value of £75,000 per annum. On the strength of our experience we may claim that on a restored transfer basis, the Haavara could derive an amount of £7,500,000 to £10,000,000 from Palestine imports of German goods, and from the financial transfer. Otherwise it is to be feared that after the 1st August - the date of the expiry of the transfer concession of the Haavara on a larger scale - the turnover will shrink to about 500,000 reichsmark per month, or 6 million reichsmark per year, with a net transfer yield of roughly £1,250,000 per annum. This would be tantamount to a drop of the turnover by about 80% on the figures attained in 1937, unless the negotiations between the Jewish Agency and the German authorities with regard to the cancellation of the transfer restrictions could be brought to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion.

PART B.

Proposals for emigration and transfer based on the experiences of the existing Jewish Transfer Organisations.

Part B. Proposals for emigration and transfer based on the experience of the existing Jewish Transfer Organizations.

20) Germany's Contribution

In the following it is endeavored to submit such proposals for Germany's contribution as might be acceptable to the German Government and be capable of realization.

The various proposals for the contribution of the German Government should include among others:-

a) The organized liquidation of the property of the Jews in Germany and Austria.

b) An initial contribution of foreign exchange by Germany facilitating the start.

c) A permanent contribution of foreign exchange by Germany as a basis of the organized transfer of capital on a reasonable footing.

d) Upkeep and development of the Jewish Emigration and Transfer Organizations (Haavara transfer system and Altreu transfer system) so that these organizations should be able through their own efforts to increase their foreign exchange funds.

e) Renouncing the special taxes imposed on Jewish emigrants.

21) Organized Liquidation of Jewish property in Germany and Austria.

The creation of a special Transfer Office within the framework of the Intergovernmental Committee for the liquidation of Jewish property in Germany and Austria is not only a humanitarian question, but also a most vital question of financing emigrants without means; it is also the most pressing problem. As is known, the "aryanization" of Jewish enterprises in Germany and especially in Austria has been effected at a most rapid pace, and has been carried through on a scale which yields only a fraction of the actual value of the enterprise. The free decision of the Jewish business owner is almost completely ignored. The sale of a business enterprise to an Aryan depends to a very great extent upon an organization established ad hoc and very closely connected with the Party. It is only a question of time when they will adopt the same methods of taking over Jewish capital invested in real estate, shares, etc., as applied to the "aryanization" of business enterprises. In any case, in Germany and in Austria, the preparation of such a scheme is already in full swing and the Goering Decree (see paragraph 26, c) affords the lawful basis for taking over at any price Jewish capital in exchange for Goering Bonds, or through some other means.

Therefore, it would be advisable that the programme of the Intergovernmental Committee should provide for the establishment of a Transfer Office to carry through jointly with a corresponding

... organization

organisation of the German Government the taking over of Jewish property on the following lines:-

a) Jewish owners should be entitled, but not obliged to effect the liquidation of their property through the Transfer Office. It would, of course, always be preferable if they could dispose of their property for cash through their own efforts, especially as far as smaller liquid assets or any part of their capital is concerned. In all other cases, the Transfer Office, however, should deal with the claims of Jewish owners ensuring by its activities at the same time the financing and the settlement abroad of emigrants without means;

b) The German Government Department concerned should be bound to negotiate with the Transfer Office in establishing the value of the assets to be taken over, and in this connection certain ways (such as the latest tax assessment) should on principle be followed;

c) The purchase price for smaller properties up to RM 100,000 should be paid in cash to the Transfer Office; for larger assets 25% should be paid in cash (the minimum cash payment being RM 100,000) the balance to be given in a kind of Reichs Treasury bonds.

d) At the time of his emigration, the owner might receive from the Transfer Office:

1) for up to RM 25,000 : 30% i.e. up to 7,500 goldmarks = 3,000 dollars;

for up to RM 50,000 : 25% i.e. up to 12,500 goldmarks = 5,000 dollars;

for up to RM 100,000: 20% i.e. up to 20,000 goldmarks = 8,000 dollars.

Whether and to what extent the Transfer Office will be able to make cash payments in foreign exchange for larger fortunes will depend upon its foreign exchange resources and its principles of distribution.

2) The Reichs Treasury Bonds with which the owners of larger fortunes are left and which, as outlined in 3), are in the event of his emigration to be converted into German Dollar Funding Bonds to be amortized on long terms, shall in any case serve to pay the taxes and rates of these persons prior to their emigration.

3) The balance of the owner's assets paid to the Transfer Office in German Treasury Bonds should, in the event of his emigration, be converted into non-interest bearing German Dollar Funding Bonds, given to him say for 50% of the nominal value of the Treasury Bonds; these dollar bonds are to be amortized by Germany in regular yearly instalments over a period of 10 or 20 years.

...22) Germany's

22) Germany's initial foreign exchange contribution for the start of organized mass emigration.

Mass emigration should immediately be put into effect in view of the reasons already outlined in paragraph 21, dealing with the present "aryanization" and seizure of Jewish assets in Germany and Austria, almost without the offer of an equivalent payment. Germany should, therefore, be requested to make a single initial contribution by selling a certain amount out of her own stock of foreign exchange to the Transfer Office. Taking as a basis for the first year's programme an organized mass emigration of at least 50,000 persons, and a single transfer contribution by Germany of £1000 per head, a sum of £50,000,000 i.e. 123 million goldmarks, would be needed. According to the estimate of experts, Germany has acquired over 1,000,000,000 goldmarks in foreign exchange, foreign shares and assets through the Anschluss, - no doubt to a large extent the property of Austrian Jews. With good will, it should therefore be possible for the German Government to make such a contribution.

The Transfer Office would pay to the Reichsbank, if required, a bonus of 50% being the additional amount which the Reichsbank itself has to pay on the average as subsidy when purchasing foreign exchange from exporters.

23) Germany's current contribution in foreign exchange.

The rapid and organized emigration of German and Austrian Jews can only be effected successfully if the German Government is prepared to open up certain current sources of foreign exchange over and above of the single initial contribution already mentioned in the previous paragraph. The following two proposals should be considered side by side:-

a) Germany's share of 25% of the Registered Mark proceeds.

In the latest "Standstill Agreement" concluded by Germany with the foreign Standstill creditors in May, 1938, it was agreed for the first time that the foreign Standstill creditors would give to Germany a certain share (25%) of the foreign exchange proceeds, arising out of the sale of registered marks (tourist marks). It might be possible for Germany to devote this current source of foreign exchange to the Transfer Office in favor of the transfer of refugees' assets. The sale of registered marks amounted yearly on the average for Germany alone (without Austria) to about 200 million RM. It is at present lower, but it should in future reach the former figure (especially if Germany will accede to the requests submitted in regard to the refugees' question), now that Austria is included. The average turnover, therefore, can be estimated at 200 million reichsmark total sales, i.e. a sale of 50 million RM yearly in favor of the German Government. At the present particularly adverse rate of exchange, the sale of registered marks yields only approximately 47%. The 50 million RM (which the Transfer Office should acquire out of the Emigrants' Transfer Fund) would, therefore, yield

... approximately

approximately 23.5 million goldmark, i.e. nearly 10 million dollars per annum.

b) Trade Arrangements

It is possible that the German Government (on lines similar to its negotiations with the Haavara) will be prepared to sacrifice foreign exchange only on a commercial basis, i.e. in connection with the increase in exports of German goods. Evidently, a systematic furtherance of exports of German goods connected with emigration and transfer is for many reasons quite impracticable in regard to other countries. It should be attempted, in a general way only, by making provisions in existing trading arrangements, on about the following lines:-

aa) England, France, Holland and Brazil would amend their clearing arrangement with Germany in the sense that a small percentage of the English, French, Dutch and Brazilian foreign exchange payments for the purchase of German goods should be acquired by the Transfer Office out of its reichsmark funds of emigrants. England, which at present retains 55% in foreign exchange of all English purchases of German goods, would for instance in future retain 58% and the difference of 3% would be paid for in reichsmark by the Transfer Office. According to the German export statistics, the export value of German goods sold to England during the first six months of the year 1938 amounted to 180 million RM. Assuming that the total amount for 1938 would be some 360 million RM, 3% would yield an amount of 10.8 million marks = 4.3 million dollars.

bb) As regards the United States, no clearing arrangement is in operation, but the same methods could, with the consent of both governments, easily be applied.

cc) According to the German export statistics, the value of German exports to England, France, Holland, The United States and Brazil during the first six months of the year 1938 amounted to about 680 million RM. Thus, exports for the whole year could be estimated at approximately 1360 million RM. If 3% of this amount could be paid by the Transfer Office using the foreign exchange for the furthering of emigration, as mentioned in regard to England, the result would be a return for 1938 of 40.8 million RM = 16.3 million dollars from this source. Together with the 23.5 million RM mentioned under aa) there would result a total of 64.3 million RM = 23.5 million dollars for this year alone.

This scheme need not be restricted to the five principal participating countries; a similar agreement could perhaps be reached with some of the other countries, from which, as in the case of England, France and Holland, Germany regularly derives, through her exports, a considerable foreign exchange surplus.

.....24) Unkeep

24) Upkeep and development of the existing Jewish emigration and transfer organizations (Haavara Transfer system and Altreu Transfer system)

All new measures to be adopted for the transfer of property of emigrants as a basis of mass emigration, will require a certain preparatory period until effective results can be reached. Therefore, the Intergovernmental Committee might give its attention to the upkeep and development of the two existing Jewish self assistance organizations in Germany and Palestine. In this respect the following might be considered:

a) For the Altreu Transfer System.

The fact is that the German Government no longer codes to the Altreu foreign exchange brought into Germany by returning non-Jewish immigrants. Thus the German Government has deprived the Altreu of its main source of transfer which it exploited in addition to the relatively small proceeds derived from its clearing arrangements with private Jewish relief organizations abroad. The Intergovernmental Committee, however, will find the organizations of the Altreu transfer system (Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland, Hilfsverein and Altreu G.m.b.H. Berlin) a suitable basis for all administrative work which the organization of mass emigration from Germany to countries other than Palestine will entail.

b) For the Haavara Transfer System.

With reference to the explanations given in paragraphs 13 - 19, it is believed that the Intergovernmental Committee will find in the Haavara Transfer Organization and its associated bodies mentioned in paragraph 15, an instrument for the immediate execution of organized mass emigration. The Haavara, as shown in paragraph 18, has up till now reached a transfer capacity of 5 to 5½ million dollars per annum, and would probably be able to increase its turnover up to a maximum of 10 million dollars by means of a general transfer permit which is not restricted to a few goods only. In that case, it would be possible, as in the past, to assist thousands of persons with and without means to emigrate to Palestine. Negotiations in this direction have been pending for months between the Jewish Agency and the German Government.

The following claims should be submitted to the German Government:-

1) The Haavara should be in a position to effect payments for all German goods required by Palestinian importers. For this purpose, the restrictions of goods listed for Palestine export should be cancelled.

2) The German Government should agree to the principle that it will not lose or benefit from exports to Palestine, as far as foreign exchange is concerned. The Haavara will, therefore, provide from the Jewish buyers in Palestine and

... transfer

transfer to the Reichsbank foreign exchange for that part of the purchase which Germany herself has paid for foreign raw materials used in the production of these goods. The remaining part of the purchase price is to be paid out of the transfer accounts of Jewish emigrants.

3) The Haavara should include in its transfer organization the furtherance of emigration of Austrian Jews to Palestine, as proposed on various occasions by the Jewish Agency.

35) Cancellation of special taxes imposed on Jewish emigrants.

In order to visualize the actual losses of property sustained by the emigrating German Jews, one must bear in mind not only the transfer deduction but also the following taxes to be paid before leaving Germany:

a) Flight Tax (applying to all emigrants irrespective of race) amounting to 25% of the last taxable property. A particular hardship is involved for Jewish emigrants, because this liability remains unchanged if in 1935 - when the conditions were much more favorable - his property exceeded RM 50,000, or his income was over RM 20,000, although property and income may have shrunk considerably since then.

b) Special tax on emigrants' belongings:

According to a decree promulgated this year, an emigrant cannot take with him such belongings as furniture, clothing, etc. unless he has previously secured the permission of the German authorities. This decree applies to those articles which were acquired after the 1st January, 1935. The prospective emigrant has to submit a list of his furniture, clothing, and other outfit etc. giving the initial value as well as the present value as estimated by him. He is then informed as to which articles he is allowed to take, and what amount in reichsmark is payable on them to the Gold-Diskont-Bank by way of special taxation. As a rule the total of the present value is assessed for this special tax, with the result that an emigrating family with furniture and personal belongings estimated at for instance RM 10,000 has to pay to the Gold-Diskont-Bank a special tax of RM 10,000 in addition to the flight tax.

c) Special tax for the financing of the Four Year Plan (Meeting Decree)

The implications of this decree which required German and foreign Jews to submit a specified list of their property by the 30th June cannot be foreseen at this stage. The methods which will be adopted for the implementing of this decree and for the forcible utilization of Jewish property for the financing of the Four Year Plan, are as yet unknown. Unconfirmed rumors in the foreign press point to an almost complete confiscation of larger Jewish fortunes in exchange for German Government bonds.

d) Estimating, for example, the property of a prospective emigrant at RM 100,000 we would arrive at the following calculation:-

... Property

Property prior to emigration		RM 100,000
Flight Tax of 25%	RM 25,000	
Special tax estimated on this property at	" 10,000	" 35,000
Remainder to be transferred:		RM 65,000.

Provided that this emigrant is fortunate enough to find the Gold-Diskont-Bank willing to purchase his 65,000 RM at the rate of 8%, he would eventually receive RM 5,200 in foreign exchange, so that of his original property of RM 100,000 he could save but 5.2%, while 94.8% were lost.

26) No special explanation is needed to state that the negotiations between the Intergovernmental Committee and the German Government should include either the cancellation or at least the modification of these special burdens imposed on Jews, as outlined above. Endeavors should at any rate be made to mitigate the Flight Tax in such a way that the Transfer Office of the Intergovernmental Committee be authorized to effect tax payments out of reichsmark profits and Treasury Bonds receipts, in accordance with paragraphs 21 and 29, on behalf of emigrants who would not be in a position to do so without sacrificing their last savings.

Furthermore, endeavors should be made to reach an agreement on the following proposals:-

a) Cancellation of the tax premium of 100% on the personal effects and household goods to be paid to the German Gold-Diskont-Bank. An adequate equipment is of great assistance to the emigrant with limited means. The emigrant should, therefore, be authorized to take out of Germany free of tax such personal goods as is already in his possession, and should, in addition, be permitted to buy and take with him new goods needed for his settlement.

b) Cancellation of further application of the Goering Decree regarding the use of Jewish property for the financing of the Four Year Plan, as these assets must be the financial basis for Jewish Emigration.

- - - - - - -

PART C.

Outline for organized Mass Emigration of Jews with and without means from Germany and Austria on the Basis of Mutual Assistance.

PART C. Outline for organised mass emigration of Jews with and without means from Germany and Austria on the basis of mutual assistance.

27) The two existing systems of emigration and transfer (Haavara Transfer and Altreu Transfer) have during the trial period of several years acquired a certain experience with regard to facilitating the migration of persons without means, especially youth, through the material assistance by the wealthier emigrants. Wealthy emigrants received the proceeds of their transfer at a somewhat higher rate of exchange. The profits derived in this way were used to pay the fares, equipment of emigrants without sufficient means, and to provide funds for their new existence. On the basis of these principles and of this experience we would like to outline below - as an example - the possibility of the emigration of 16,000 people belonging to entirely different financial and social categories, on the basis of 26.5 million Goldmarks in foreign exchange.

28). It can be assumed that the mass of Jewish emigrants consists of the following financial and social categories:-

a) Families with up to RM 100,000 liquid assets
b) Families with up to RM 50,000 " "
c) Families with up to Rm 25,000 " "
d) Families without means or with negligible savings.
e) Single emigrants without means or negligible savings.

There are as a matter of fact, still a number of Jewish families with more than RM 100,000, and it is for the liquidation of their assets that the proposal in paragraph 22 is made. The above grouping is selected for the purpose of showing as simply as possible the categories of potential emigrants.

29). 16,500 Emigrants for every 26.5 million Goldmarks.

The following scheme is based upon the assumption of a foreign exchange fund of approximately 26.5 million Goldmarks put at the disposal of the Transfer Office and to be apportioned among the different categories of emigrants:-

150 families, approximately 450 souls, each family transferring 100,000 RM on the basis of 20% transfer yield, i.e. an actual transfer of 20,000 Goldmarks -3,000,000 Gldmk.

500 families, approximately 1500 souls, each family transferring 50,000 Rm on the basis of 25% transfer yield, i.e. an actual transfer of 12,500 Goldmarks -6,250,000 Gldmk.

1000 families, approximately 3000 souls each family transferring 25,000 RM on the basis of 30% transfer yield, i.e. an actual transfer of 7,500 Goldmarks -7,500,000 Gldmk.

2500 families, approximately 7500 souls, not possessing any capital, would out of the surplus profit of the Transfer Office realized from the foregoing three groups of capitalists, receive financial assistance of 2,000 Goldmarks each -5,000,000 Gldmk.

4000 single emigrants - 4000 souls without capital would receive a financial assistance of 1,000 Goldmarks each- 4,000,000 Gldmk.

4150 families, approximately 12,450 souls
4000 single emigrants - 4,000 "
in all 16,450 emigrants
would require a total amount of ..... 25,750,000 Gldmk.

The organization expenses abroad (administration expenses only) can be estimated on the basis of our experience at approximately 3% of the transferred capital, i.e. 750,000 Gldmk.

Total amount required for 16,450 emigrants: 26,500,000 Gldmk.

30) The foreign exchange resources of the Transfer Office and their purchase price in Reichsmark.

The foreign exchange income of the Transfer Office of the Intergovernmental Committee to be expected from the realization of the above proposals would in the first year amount of 187.3 million goldmarks - 74.9 million dollars, which have to be acquired for an amount of 295.7 million reichsmark, as follows:-

a) For the single initial German foreign exchange contribution as suggested in par.22, the Reichsbank would most probably demand the payment of an export premium of 50%, thus the outlay would be 123,000,000 Gldmk- 184,500,000 RM

b) From the proceeds of registered marks there would result annually (taking into account the existing rate of exchange of 47% for registered Marks) an amount of approximately ..... 23,500,000 Gldmk- 50,000,000 " in accordance with paragraph 23a).

c) In accordance with para. 23b) regarding the current

foreign exchange contribution of 40.0 million goldmarks from export proceeds per annum, the Reichsbank would most probably demand the payment of an export premium of 50%, thus the outlay would be: 40,800,000 Gldmk- 61,200,000 RM

In the first year the Intergovernmental Committee would thus receive: 187,300,000 Gldmk-295,700,000 RM through the accumulation of the single initial contribution of the German Government together with the two current foreign exchange sources to be opened up.

As a rough estimate it can, therefore, be assumed that a transfer premium (reichsmark loss) of 108,400,000 RM - somewhat over 37%, would result. As the Transfer Office, as mentioned in paragraph 29), would be in a position to charge transfer premiums of between 70 and 80%, it is evident that a considerable reichsmark profit would result from the difference between the sum to be paid on the one hand for the purchase of the foreign exchange, and on the other hand to be charged to the emigrants. That difference would easily cover the following reichsmark needs in Germany connected with this mass emigration:

1) Financial assistance for the categories of people without means, as mentioned in paragraph 29).

2) Payment of fares and adequate personal equipment of emigrants without means including expenses for training in new professions.

3) Administration expenses of the Transfer Office.

4) Contributions to the private organizations engaged on the selection and preparation of emigrants, as well as to charitable institutions (i.e. schools, hospitals, and especially homes for the aged who are unsuited for emigration). These institutions suffer more and more through the emigration of wealthy people and are in danger of being compelled to close down because of lack of funds.

5) Payment of the Flight Tax and of other special taxes for emigrants who cannot do so themselves unless they sacrifice their last savings.

31) The previous paragraphs do not provide further possibilities for earnings in reichsmark and foreign exchange, which would result from our suggestion in paragraph 21) regarding the inclusion of the liquidation of the larger fortunes of Jews in Germany including Austria. As already mentioned in the Fund of foreign exchange with the Transfer Office should - if possible - also be used to provide these wealthier people, whose capital often represents the result of the successful work of generations,

with a moderate percentage for the transfer of their property. At the same time they should also contribute to a greater extent to the costs of reichsmark and foreign exchange for emigrants without means.

32) Emigration capacity in the first year and in the following years based on the above scheme:

Taking as a basis the emigration scheme as outlined in paragraph 29) which provides for a cost of 26.5 million goldmarks for every 16,500 emigrants, the emigration capacity of the Transfer Office based on the foreign exchange sources mentioned in paragraph 30), would be as follows:-

a) For the first year:

Foreign exchange sources: 187.3 million goldmarks; i.e. seven times 26.5 million)
emigration capacity therefore: seven times 16,500 - 115,000 persons for emigration in the first year.

b) For the following years:

The 128 million goldmark foreign exchange contribution by the German Government being no longer available, we would arrive at an estimate of 64.3 million goldmarks of current foreign exchange income, based on the figures for 1938. This would be tantamount to an annual emigration capacity of roughly 40,000 persons.

c) Moreover, there would be the additional possibility of emigrating several thousand persons to Palestine by the Haavara Transfer System.

33) The question of the destination of the emigrants from Germany, either the 115,000 in the first year, or the 40,000 or more in the following years, has not been examined in this memorandum. Still, the knowledge that no emigrant will, according to our proposals, leave Germany without some means and will therefore not become a public charge to the country of his destination, might be helpful to the Intergovernmental Committee in discharging its difficult task.

*****

~~Confidential~~.

Communication from the Director to the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Intergovernmental Committee.

The Director wishes to express his appreciation of the hospitality of the British Government in receiving the Committee and the office of the Director in London, and also his appreciation of the opportunity afforded him, at the session of the Committee on August 29th, to meet the officers of the Committee and to review with them the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria, with which the Committee and the Director is faced.

The Director takes note of the views advanced at this meeting by the Vice-Chairman representing the French Government, Senator Berenger, and by other officers, as to the importance of the financial aspect of the problem. The Director takes this opportunity to communicate formally to the officers of the Committee his immediate readiness to receive from the Governments whom they represent their views on the financial question and to recommend that the Chairman and the Vice-Chairmen invite their representatives in London to present such views and to discuss in detail with the Director this important matter. The Director feels that the possibilities of transferring property of involuntary emigrants in Germany into foreign exchange for their use in other countries should be thoroughly studied. In order that preparation for the approach to be made to the German Government by the Intergovernmental Committee may proceed along sound lines, the Director feels that he should, in the manner suggested above, have the benefit of such advice.

At the meeting of the Committee in London on August 29th, the Director and the Vice-Chairman representing the United States, reported to the officers of the Committee the conclusions reached at a recent meeting in Paris, at which Mr. Myron Taylor and the Director discussed the method of approach to the German Government with the United States Ambassador to Germany, and with the United States Ambassadors to France and Great Britain. The Director notes with satisfaction the unanimity of the officers of the Committee at this meeting in deciding to request their respective Governments to instruct their Ambassadors in Berlin to consult and collaborate with each other as to the nature and method of the formal enquiry to be made to the German Government, at a time deemed by them auspicious, as to whether it will be prepared to receive the Director. The Director also wishes to express his appreciation to the Chairman of the Committee, Lord Winterton, for his renewed assurance on behalf of the British Government that it will instruct the British Ambassador in Berlin to join the United States Ambassador in making such enquiry.

The Director now desires to place before the officers of the Committee for their attention, and for the attention of the Governments whom they represent, his views as to what the next essential step in the work of the Committee should be.

As requested at Evian and reaffirmed at London, it is essential that the Governments which are represented through officers of the Committee should manifest their continued leadership in this effort by furnishing in confidence to the Chairman statements as to the number and types of involuntary immigrants they are prepared to receive for permanent settlement, and as to the number for whom they are willing to afford organized facilities for temporary residence and retraining with a view to migration overseas. To date information of this character has been received only from the United States and from the Dominican Republic. For the reasons outlined below, it is particularly urgent at this stage of the Committee's work that such statements should be forthcoming. Briefly, such statements are essential at the present time as a necessary preliminary to negotiations with the German Government, as a manifestation of leadership which is required to evoke response from countries adapted for final settlement, as a basis for immediate steps to coordinate the effort and resources currently devoted to the problem in countries of refuge and, finally, as a first indication of concrete results in the work of the Committee so necessary and urgent if the morale of the unfortunates with whom we are concerned is to be maintained.

1. A necessary preliminary to negotiations with Germany.

In the last analysis, it is clear that any hope of substantial accomplishment in eventual negotiations with the German Government will depend upon whether the Director, prior to such negotiations, will be in a position to hold out on behalf of the Committee reliable expectations that, assuming the German Government is prepared to make a satisfactory contribution, the world will be prepared to receive a very substantial number of involuntary immigrants each year over a period of years.

It is reliably estimated that, since the rise to power of National Socialism in 1933, a total of approximately 153,000 involuntary emigrants have, in one way or another, left Germany proper, and that, since the Austrian "Anschluss" in March of this year, a total of approximately 13,000 such persons have left former Austria - making an aggregate of approximately 166,000 involuntary emigrants who have left the Greater Reich since 1933. This record shows an average of approximately 33,000 persons per year, and it is clear that the tempo of involuntary emigration has increased in the last two years in spite of the stricter immigration policies universally adopted by the countries of refuge contiguous to Germany and also by many other countries. There can be no true forecast for the future on the

basis of these figures since, as a consequence of the independent pursuit by the German Government of policies causing involuntary emigration, the cumulative burden on the receiving countries has become intolerable. However, given these results as a measure of success in this matter from the standpoint of those in control of the policy of the German Government, it will be difficult to impress upon that Government the advantages of seeking a solution by mutual effort unless some assurances can be offered that the rest of the world will be prepared, under certain conditions, to receive from Germany in the future a larger number of involuntary emigrants than it has in these past few years.

This is not the moment to envisage a lack of assistance from the German Government in the task of regularising involuntary emigration because refusal by Germany so to assist would inevitably lead to adoption by its neighbours in self defence of even more exclusive policies, damaging not only to potential emigrants but to the interests of the German Government and the estimation in which it stands before the world. If there can be reliable ground for expectation that arrangements can be made for a planned exodus of a greater number annually than has hitherto been the case, and opportunity will be afforded to those in control of German policy to reach a decision on broad grounds, in fact favourable to the unfortunates with whom we are concerned, and in furtherance of the domestic policies of the Reich which result in involuntary emigration.

2. Leadership required before response from countries of final settlement can be anticipated.

There are particular reasons why this request is made at this time by the Director to the Governments represented by officers of the Committee.

It is recognized that each of the Governments so represented is faced with its own special difficulties in formulating definitely at this time what its contribution can be. It is also realized that ultimately, if substantial numbers are to be moved, places of final settlement must lie in the relatively undeveloped portions of the world which possess the resources and the capacity to absorb new settlers. The Director has in mind the obligation imposed by the Evian Resolution to negotiate with countries of final settlement and also the definite indications which have already been received by the Committee or communicated to him as to the possibilities of settlement in certain hitherto undeveloped portions of the world.

However, the Director feels strongly that the Governments represented by officers of the Committee should indicate their contributions to the solution of our problem before a further approach is made to the other participating Governments of countries which offer

possibilities of final settlement. The latter Governments are awaiting the leadership of the former, among whom are the important colonial powers of the world. It is essential, therefore, at this stage in the efforts of the Committee that each Government now addressed make its contribution by assurances both as to numbers of involuntary emigrants who can be permanently received and numbers who can be afforded temporary residence and retraining on an organized basis.

Misapprehensions now prevail in certain quarters to the effect that the old world wishes to shove off upon the new the immediate burden which, under prevailing conditions of disorderly exodus, involuntary emigration now brings to the receiving country. The overseas possessions and associated dominions of these leading countries, and the other countries of final settlement, must be led to realize that, if involuntary emigration can be organized so as to provide facilities for retraining upon a sufficient scale and for appropriate selection of immigrants, persons coming from a country like Germany advanced in the arts and technique of modern civilization, will constitute not "refugees" but an element of intelligence and ability which will enrich countries willing and able to receive them. This can be accomplished by exemplifying on a broader scale the successful experience of the private organizations in retraining these persons as qualified agriculturists and skilled handicraftsmen.

It may be further anticipated, assuming for the moment concrete results from eventual negotiations with the German Government on the transfer problem, that countries of final settlement will also appreciate the fact that the aggregate of tangible wealth, which would accrue to a country willing to receive involuntary immigrants in substantial numbers, would be significant. It would be premature at this time to say more in this connection, except that the Director has received indications to the effect that, assuming that satisfactory arrangements can be made with the German Government, loans from private sources might be forthcoming to assist in financing involuntary emigration and in furnishing capital required for the development of countries of final settlement.

Given the shock caused by publicity as to the magnitude of the problem, and the obvious difficulties of regularising the existing chaotic conditions of exodus so as to permit an orderly migration over a period of years, it is understandable that the response of the countries adapted for final settlement by reason of their resources and their needs, should wait upon the leadership of the great Powers represented by officers of the Committee.

3. <u>Necessity of statements from the leading Governments as a basis for coordination of the effort and resources currently devoted to the problem in countries of refuge.</u>

Those countries contiguous to Germany, which are faithful to the generous tradition of granting asylum, since 1933 have borne and, to a considerable extent, continue to bear the immediate brunt of involuntary emigration from that country. However, given the cooperation of other Governments not immediately faced by the grave external and internal problems arising due to the fact of common boundaries with the country of origin, it may be anticipated that the countries of refuge will be prepared to make their contributions not only with a view of the broader problem but in their own self-interest.

The disorderly character of the present exodus from Germany, resulting from intensification of pressure since the Anschluss and recently aggravated by widespread illegal entries apparently countenanced by certain local authorities of that country, has given rise to the international problem with which the Committee is concerned. The countries of refuge have a particular interest in this problem. Under existing conditions it cannot be expected nor is it desirable, pending formulation by the Committee of an adequate programme along the lines hereafter outlined, that countries of refuge should admit involuntary emigrants from Germany, who have no expectation of migrating further and whose reception is not assured by friends or relatives, in greater number than the current resources of the private organizations will permit. It is only frank to admit that the situation has continued to deteriorate since the Evian Conference, and that, if existing conditions of exodus are not shortly modified, the countries of refuge will be forced to adopt even more stringent measures to protect their borders.

In negotiations with the German Government, the Committee will lend its collective weight to the representations already made to that Government by particular countries of refuge that the pressure upon their borders has become intolerable. Yet, whatever the results in that direction, the burden to these countries of existing numbers within their borders will remain. If the Committee is to aid in a solution of their internal problems by opening up settlement possibilities overseas, immediate cooperation from the countries of refuge in providing facilities for temporary residence and retraining on an organized basis is essential.

The Director believes that much could be accomplished in this direction by coordination under Government auspices of the effort and resources of the private organizations currently devoted to relief in the various countries of refuge of involuntary emigrants of German and Austrian origin. In important countries of refuge, generosity in granting asylum has not been matched by organization of facilities for reception. Unsatisfactory conditions have arisen in these countries as a result of the unexpected accumulation of numbers in the course of this and similar influxes during the post-war years and as a result of the change in the character of migration. Under the existing disorderly conditions of exodus, the

individual or group enters without means or assurance of support and without expectation of being able to migrate further. Due to limited absorptive capacity, the economic depression and the obstacles which have grown up to the normal migratory movement overseas, the countries of refuge have been forced to limit or deny the right to work to the involuntary emigrant. Legally stateless and without the means or opportunity for self-support, he becomes the "refugee". Continuing to be treated as a self-sufficient individual, he becomes a source of difficulty to the local police and administrative authorities, and indirectly a heavy drain upon Government resources. Both in the interests of the involuntary emigrant and of the Government authorities, special recognition should be given to his peculiar economic as well as to his special legal status. From the standpoint of internal administration alone it would seem that considerable savings would result if the involuntary emigrant without special qualifications should be required to reside in special localities set apart for the purpose. The contribution of the authorities would consist for the most part in establishing such districts under Government auspices and in furnishing land for the purpose. The authorities could thus more easily keep track of the numbers and status of individual involuntary emigrants, would realize savings in internal administration and avoid the danger inherent in the congregation of refugees and alien elements in urbancentres.

Such a system would also permit savings in the funds devoted to relief by the private organizations. The segregation of involuntary emigrants involved is also essential if they are to be afforded the opportunity of retraining to readapt them for migration overseas. In this connection, if the Governments of countries of refuge should adopt such approach as the one most likely to contribute ultimately to the solution of the internal problems caused by involuntary emigration, the fact-that the private organizations most experienced in retraining and in overseas settlement are located in countries of refuge - and the fact-that a substantial portion of the money devoted to relief of involuntary emigrants in those countries comes from private organizations abroad which are interested in finding a solution by way of permanent settlement rather than the palliative of relief, - should guarantee every cooperation.

The interests of countries of refuge will be served if the efforts of the Committee are successful in opening up places of settlement overseas. The Director recognizes that in such event there should be a fair allocation between involuntary emigrants coming directly from Germany and those of German and Austrian origin now residing in countries of refuge which cooperate in the work of the Committee. Moreover, concrete results in finding overseas outlets for this limited class of involuntary emigrants might lead to renewal of normal migratory movements, and thus ultimately contribute to relieve the more comprehensive burden of existing numbers which, in important countries of refuge, is largely made up of other refugees and alien elements. However, as emphasized in the preceding

section, present leadership and concrete results from retraining are essential before response from countries adapted for final settlement can be anticipated. Given assurance from the Governments now addressed as to cooperation with respect to other aspects of the task, an immediate start could be made to organize extensive facilities for retraining both in the interests of the countries of refuge and the stranded migrants of German and Austrian origin within their borders.

4. Contributions from Governments Essential as Basis for Mobilization of Private Resources and to Maintain the Morale of Involuntary Emigrants.

If the cooperation of the private organizations and individuals who now give money and their effort and in the past have given so liberally of both, is eventually to be mobilized for a supreme effort, a manifestation of leadership by the Governments now addressed is essential. Unless these organizations individually believe that the Governments concerned will cooperate substantially in the way of opening their doors to involuntary immigrants, they cannot be expected to organize their efforts for an appeal to the charity of the world to give upon a scale which might materially assist to a solution of the problem of financing involuntary emigration. Even more important is the fact that high hopes have been raised in the hearts of the unfortunate people whose fate is our direct concern. The Director is convinced that if their morale is to be maintained, under the increasingly difficult conditions and under circumstances where any approach to an adequate solution requires time, it is of crucial importance that Great Britain, France, the Netherlands and Brazil should now join with the United States in leadership by stating what definite contributions they are prepared to make.

With the above ideas in mind the Director wishes to suggest a definite program regarding the number of involuntary emigrants, both those within and those who have left the Greater Reich, for whom eventual provision should be made in places of final settlement and for whom more immediate provision should be made either in places of settlement or in places of temporary refuge, over the period of the next five years.

The maximum number of potential involuntary emigrants in the Greater Reich with whom the Committee may have to concern itself was estimated, at the meeting of the Committee in London on August 4th, to be 616,900 persons. It was pointed out that this total included many who, due to old age, disability or for other reasons, would be unable to leave the country. On the other hand, the above total did not include those involuntary emigrants who had left the country of origin and who remain in a refugee status for the most part in countries of refuge contiguous to Germany. The number of these persons, estimated by the High Commissioner of the League of Nations to be 35,000 at the time of the "Anschluss", is believed to approximate

47,000 at the present time. In the light of these considerations and on the basis of the most recent information, the basic total for the immediate consideration of the Committee in formulating a program for the next five years should be placed at not less than 500,000 persons.

This total, although large, would seem not only determined by need but within the resources and capabilities for absorption of the participating Governments. It means that, pursuant to the program, arrangements would be made to increase the current level of emigration from Germany to an average of 100,000 persons annually over a period of the next five years.

In view of the public statement of the President of the United States in initiating the call for the Evian Conference, there reaffirmed and significantly implemented by the representative of that country, now a Vice-Chairman of the Committee, so as to fit into a program extending over a period of years such as now proposed, we may rely upon the United States to receive currently involuntary emigrants of German and Austrian origin up to the limit of its quota law - approximately 27,000 annually - and thus ultimately to account for at least one quarter of the aggregate total envisaged by the program. Confidence that the program is practicable will be justified if Great Britain and the Dominions can give assurances that the Empire will match, in numbers to be absorbed each year, the contribution of the United States; and if France, looking to the permanent hitherto undeveloped portions of its colonial Empire for the establishment of permanent settlers in numbers approximating the number of involuntary emigrants now in France, and the Netherlands will make their primary contribution by providing facilities for temporary residence and retraining on an organized basis.

The primary contribution of France, the Netherlands and the contribution of other countries of refuge willing to cooperate with the Committee in the common task, and in the hope ultimately of relieving the burden of numbers within their borders, should consist in the organization under Government auspices of special centres equipped to provide the opportunity of retraining to all involuntary emigrants of German and Austrian origin within their borders who are fit for readaption to new ways of living, and they should agree to receive for that purpose additional persons from the country of origin when the burden of existing numbers is alleviated or assurance received that such persons may eventually migrate overseas. In the case of Great Britain, it is felt that the immediate assurance, both on its own account and on behalf of the colonies as to numbers to be received for permanent settlement, should approximate one-half of the desired total for the Empire as a whole - namely, about 13,000 persons annually. In addition, it is hoped that the mother country will not only use her good offices in discussions with the Dominions, but that, in the exercise of her normal function

as cradle for emigration to the Empire, she will also establish retraining facilities for a substantial number of involuntary emigrants and permit the expansion of the successful experiment in educating young persons of German and Austrian origin within her borders, with a view to producing immigrants acceptable to the colonies and Dominions. It is anticipated, especially in view of the unfortunate situation in Palestine, that Great Britain will feel a responsibility to make a particular effort in helping the Committee to find settlement possibilities in other parts of the world.

Upon this basis, involving extensive retraining to adapt involuntary emigrants to the ways of the new world and technical organization to facilitate selection of emigrants, it is to be hoped that the Dominions will shortly be in a position to give definite assurances as to numbers to be permanently received to complete the Empire contribution of an aggregate of 27,000 persons annually.

Given such assurances from the leading nations with regard to numbers approximating one half the desired total annually, with regard to reception of additional numbers for temporary sojourn and with regard to adequate retraining, we may have confidence in anticipating that, as the great countries of Latin America come to appreciate the values in human intelligence, skill and ability thus available, and, as vigorous action is taken to follow up settlement possibilities in hitherto undeveloped territories of the world, reception of the balance of the annual quota will follow to complete the program.

It should be emphasized that the Director does not entertain expectations that the world outside Germany is willing or able to absorb destitute people, or look forward, except in special cases, to colonization or mass settlement methods on a large scale. The Governments now addressed are asked to state the numbers they are prepared to receive upon the assumption that a solution of the problem of financing involuntary emigration is independently arrived at, by negotiation with Germany or otherwise. In other words, the Governments concerned are asked to furnish such statements upon the explicit understanding that the immigrants to be received will either themselves possess sufficient resources or arrive with sufficient guarantees to comply with existing requirements of law. Assuming a solution of the basic financial problem and the gaining of time necessary for adequate retraining and for accomplishing an orderly exodus over a period of years, the Director believes that the numbers suggested could be absorbed under the prevailing method of immigration by infiltration of individuals, families and small groups, and without departure by the Governments concerned from the selective policies embodied in the existing immigration laws and practices of so many of them. 500,000 persons means roughly 140,000 families. The experience of the present exodus from Germany has shown how surely we can rely upon the ability of an individual who has had the initial chance to emigrate, whether he be worker or even child, to draw after him eventually the remaining members of his family.

The Director hopes that this attempt to outline a workable program to meet the problem of involuntary emigration from Germany including Austria will aid the Governments addressed in formulating definite statements as to the contributions they are prepared to make. For the reasons set forth, such statements are of particular urgency at this stage in the effort of the Intergovernmental Committee. In suggesting the nature and extent of the contributions hoped for from the leading Governments, the Director has attempted to do no more than to point out the lines of endeavour and the obvious expectations which must be realized if a program, commensurate in scope with the problem, is to be evolved under their leadership.

Statements should be made in confidence to the Chairman, Lord Winterton. It was the sense of the officers of the Committee at the recent meeting in London that no statements received or to be received should be circulated to the participating Governments or become the subject of any publicity until communications from all the Governments represented by officers should have been received and the matter further considered.